UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

MICHAEL KODZO AMEMO

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

OCTOBER, 2011

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING IN

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE KADJEBI DISTRICT

BY

MICHAEL KODZO AMEMO

Dissertation submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and

Administration, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for award of Master of Education degree in Educational Planning

and Administration.

OCTOBER 2011

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I here by declare that this dissertation is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this University or elsewhere.

Candidate's signature: ……………………………. Date: …………………….

Name: Michael Kodzo Amemo

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the dissertation were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Supervisor's signature: ………………………. Date: …………………………..

Name: Mr. J.M Dzinyela

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find out the state of teachers' participation in senior high school decision-making in the Kadjebi District. Questionnaires were used to collect data from 84 randomly selected professional teachers on the level of teacher participation in school decision-making, the school decision-making areas of teachers' participation, the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making, the teachers' demographic characteristics associated with their participation in school decision-making and the factors which influence teachers' participation in school decision-making.

The study revealed that teachers were most often in consultative decision-making with their school heads. Also the teachers always participated in curriculum and instructional activities and occasionally engaged in school operation and decisions that promote school-community relationship. However, they never participated in decision-making on students' admission and placement staffing and financial matters. Teachers participated in school decision-making through delegation, school meeting, school Board of Governors, and school committee system. It is recommended that heads of schools adopt leadership styles that would create the needed environment for teachers to participate in all areas of school decision-making of their schools in order to bring about improvement in their performance and that of their students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife Paulina Amemo and children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

The importance of Education in national development has been identified by a lot of politicians, economists and educationists. Education is essential for individual self-actualization and enhancement. According to Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), the measure of progress and development of any country depends on the provision and quality of education. The emphasis on quality education must be linked among other things to the role the teacher plays in delivering quality education. It is therefore necessary to trace the history of education in Ghana to identify the role of the teacher in the provision of quality education through his involvement in decision making.

The important role that teachers play in decision making in Senior High Schools towards the achievement of educational goals cannot be overemphasised. It is believed that educational goals can best be achieved through the effective participation of teachers in decision making. This was emphasised by Kochlar (2001), when he stated that "the teacher is the most vital single factor in the system of education; it is the teacher who matters most as far as the quality of education is concerned". He further added that "the teacher is the supreme factor in education" (p. 125).

Governments since the pre-colonial period introduced a number of educational policy decisions to improve the academic performance of both

basic and secondary school students in Ghana. For example, Governor Griffith passed the 1887 Education Ordinance Act for Ghana (Annoh, 1995). This act stated among other things the setting up of a Board of Education. This Board formulated policies for the inspection of government (public) schools, certification of trained teachers and the payment of grants to public schools. These grants were paid to schools on the basis of students' performance in a yearly examination conducted by the inspectors of schools (Abosi & Brookman-Amissah (Eds), 1992; Annoh, 1995).

In effect the amount of grant received by each school depends on the number of students who passed the yearly examination. Also the salary of a teacher of the school depended on the grant allotted for the students who passed the examination in his/her class. This was referred to as "payment by results". The main reason was to encourage teachers who were the prime factors in teaching and learning to work harder to improve the academic performance of the students.

Governor John Peter Rodger de-linked the payment of government grants to public schools from students' academic performance. He rather linked it to the "general efficiency of teaching in public school'' (Aboagye, 2002; Abosi & Brookman-Amissah (Eds.), 1992). By this policy emphasis was placed on the quality of teaching methods of teachers in public schools. Consequently a number of Teacher Training Colleges were opened. The opening of Teacher Training Colleges emphasised the role of well trained and equipped teacher. Unfortunately the expected improvement in quality of education was not attained (Bame, 1991). By 1919, Governor Frederick Gordon Guggisberg found it appropriate to link teacher performance and

2

students' achievement to the provision of required resources. He therefore closed down all schools that did not have the requisite physical resources including certificated teachers (Antwi, 1992). The Accelerated Development plan for education came into effect in January 1952 under the Nkrumah administration and was seen as a solution to the educational development problem in Ghana. Many schools were opened and by February 1955, there were 429,518 pupils in primary schools, 113,889 students in middle schools and 12,092 students in secondary schools (Bame, 1991).

With the implementation of the 1961 Education Act which stipulated fee-free compulsory primary and middle school education enrolment increased in both the basic and secondary schools. For example, the enrolment of students aged 16-21years into second cycle schools rose from 2% to 6% (UNESCO statistics cited in Antwi, 1992). Consequently the quality of education was sacrificed for quantity of education (Bame, 1991). The National Redemption Council (NRC) in an attempt to address the poor quality of education initiated some reforms in the pre-tertiary education in 1974. Resource constraints prevented the full implementation of the reform.

The 17-year pre-tertiary education was reformed to a six-year primary education, three-year junior secondary school education and four-year secondary education[6:3:4] in 1976 with the setting up of nine experimental junior secondary schools by the Ghana Education Service (Aboagye, 2002). As a result, these experimental schools had to operate alongside the existing ones. That is, the six-year primary education, four-year middle school education followed by seven-year secondary education[6:4:7], and the six-year primary education, two years of middle school education followed by a two-

3

year continuation middle school education [6:2:2:7] (Aboagye, 2002; Antwi, 1992). This distorted the nation's educational philosophy and marred the quality of education. There was the need to correct this situation.

In 1987, the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) government introduced a major educational reform in Ghana which affected the entire structure and content of education in Ghana. The existing structure of education was changed to six-year primary education, three-year junior secondary education, three-year senior secondary education and four-year university education. This structure apart from reducing the duration of formal education from twenty one years to sixteen years also encouraged vocational and technical education and broadened the scope of the general curriculum. The reform also addressed the constraints that impeded student performance in public schools, through the provision of physical, financial and human resources, the training of teachers and the strengthening of management of all public schools (Aboagye, 2002; Antwi 1992).

These efforts although very laudable did not succeed in improving the performance in public schools. For example the result of the 2002 Criterion – reference test in English and Mathematics administered in primary six in the country indicated that out of 14,423 pupils who took the test in English, 60% obtained scores between 15% and 44%, and out of 14,951 pupil who took the test in Mathematics, 82% scored between 15% and 44% (Ministry of Education 2003). The low academic performance manifested itself at the junior and secondary school as well. For example, the 2004 July/August Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination (SSSCE) revealed that out of a total of 96,668 candidates who registered for the examination, only 51%

passed in six or more subjects, 33% passed in five or fewer subjects, 35% failed all subjects, 0.5% of the candidates were absent, 0.2% had one or more of their subjects cancelled while 11.8% candidates' results were withheld pending investigation into examination irregularities (West Africa Examination Council, WAEC 2005).

Clearly this is the situation of pre-tertiary education in Ghana. It is against this backdrop that the president's Committee on Review of Education Reform in Ghana observed that the outcomes of school education are not satisfactory as compared to its objectives (Government of Ghana [GOG], 2002). To this background, if the state does not take effective measures to address the situation, the human resource base of Ghana may dwindle, resulting in unpleasant consequences for the economy. In view of this, a New Education Reform was launched under the Kufour administration in 2007.This was expected to bring about the highest quality learning results and outcomes. The reform focused on content and structure, teacher education, information and communication technology as well as technical/vocational education and training and management efficiency and effectiveness.

It has become necessary to trace the background of the study to the history of education in Ghana to unearth the involvement of teachers in the planning and implementation (participation) in any of these reforms in the past and how it pertains now. For example in the 1987 and the 2007 education reforms, teachers sharply criticized the policies for the non-participation of teachers in the formulation of the policies. They claimed that they have been loaded with a lot of work with limited resources and inadequate remuneration. Whatever happens in the classrooms and the school environment in the

secondary schools should be linked with whatever decisions are taken as far as education is concerned and therefore the major player, in education delivery, the teacher should always participate in decision making (Kochlar, 2001). Clearly classroom teachers did not participate directly in the formulation of any of these educational reform strategies. They were not in any way consulted but only informed and instructed on what to do with every new reform.

Statement of the Research Problem

Over the years, the academic performance of students in Senior High Schools have not been satisfactory as expected (Government of Ghana (GOG, 2002). For example, the percentage of candidates awarded General Certificate of Education (GCE `O'level) in 1970 rose from 50.3% to a high of 73.7% in 1975. This figure dropped to 65.8% in 1977 and rose slightly to 69.7% in 1978. However, it went down to as low as 40.1% and 46.2% in 1980 and 1981 respectively. Again the percentage of candidates who passed the General Certificate of Examination (G.C.E. 'O'level) in one or more subjects declined from 32.4% in 1970 to 19.4 % in 1975. It however rose steadily to 45.9% in 1980 and to 47.6% in 1981 (Antwi, 1992).

Six years after the implementation of the 1987 Education Reform, the percentage of candidates who passed in the core subjects (Mathematics, English Language, Integrated Science and Social Studies) stood at 60% (West African Examination Council [WAEC] 2001, as cited in (GOG, 2002). Again this shows the state of Senior High School education in Ghana for the past years of which Senior High Schools in the Kadjebi district are part. For

example in 2002, out of a total of 214 candidates who entered for the July/August Senior Secondary Schools Certificate Examination (SSSCE) in Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School, only 46% passed in six or more subjects. In the same school in 2003 out of 223 candidates who entered for the examination only 45% passed in six or more subjects .In 2004, 55% out of a total of 216 candidates presented passed in six or more subjects. (West African Examination Council statement of Result in the School 2002, 2003, 2005). At Dodi-Papase Senior High Technical School, 58% out of 91 candidates presented in 2007, passed in six or more subjects and in 2008, 72% out of the total of 88 candidates presented for the West African Senior School Certificate Examination, passed in six or more subjects (West African Examination Council statement of Result in the school , 2008).In 2009, 82% out of 350 presented for the West African Senior School Certificate Examination (WASSCE) passed in six or more subjects in Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School. Although teachers participate in the marking and scoring of students' scripts, they do not participate in decisions regarding the planning of the content of the syllabus, staffing, physical facilities and financial matters. All these directly affect teacher performance and student achievement. Stakeholders in education support the view that teacher participation in decision-making at all levels of education delivery can bring about tremendous improvement in academic performance for students (GOG, 2002). This has been corroborated by studies that indicated that teacher participation in school decision-making leads to higher academic achievement for students (Atakpa & Ankomah, 1998; Smylie, 1996).

In attempting to search for solutions to such problems various stakeholders in education, social commentators, educationists and authors have recommended the participation and involvement of teachers in decision–making (Atakpa & Ankomah, 1998). Again studies conducted elsewhere involving Senior High Schools have found out that teacher participation and involvement in decision- making is associated with increased academic achievement for students (Kuku & Taylor, 2002; Smylie, 1996).

It is in the light of low and fluctuating academic achievements of students that this study attempts to look at the state of teachers' participation in decision-making in these schools.

Purpose of the Study

This study is to find out the state of teacher participation in public Senior High School decision-making in the Kadjebi District. The focus of the study is on;

1. Areas of teachers' participation in school decision-making.

2. The ways of involving teachers in school level decision–making.

3. Teachers' demographic characteristics that are associated with their participation in school decision-making.

4. Factors that influence teacher participation in school decision – making.

Research Questions

The study was designed to answer the following research questions.

1. What is the level of teachers' participation in school decision-making in Senior High Schools in the Kadjebi district.

2. In what school level decision-making areas are teachers participating?

3. What are the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making?

4. What demographic characteristics of teachers are associated with their participation in school decision-making?

5. What factors influence teachers' participation in school decision-making?

Significance of the Study

The study into the state of teacher participation in public senior high schools in the Kadjebi District would be expected to benefit school heads and teachers to better understand what really pertain in their schools with regards to teacher participation in decision-making. It would be useful to training officers who wish to guide school heads to modify their leadership styles. It would also serve as the basis on which school heads and teachers could put in place interventions that could either maintain high participation of teachers in school activities or ensure greater participation of teachers in decision-making where teachers are found to exhibit low involvement in order to bring about increased academic achievement for students. Additionally the result of the study will add to existing literature in teachers' participation in school decision-making in Ghana.

Delimitation of the Study

This study was to find out the state of teacher participation in school decision-making in the Kadjebi District, with specific focus on the three Senior High Schools in the district. The focus was on;

a. The level of teachers' participation in school decision-making.

b. The school level decision-making areas of teachers' participation.

c. The ways of involving teachers in school decision-making.

d. The teachers' demographic characteristics that are associated with their involvement in school decision-making.

e. The factors which influence teachers' participation in school decision-making.

f. The study covers the Kadjebi district of the Volta region.

This study did not find out the state of participation of the heads of schools or the non-teaching staff in school decision-making.

Limitations of the Study

Some respondents were reluctant to respond for fear of being accused of betraying their head of school although they were not asked to disclose their identity.

I had to reassure them of high confidentiality before they were able to respond. Their fear might have influenced the responses given and the findings of the study. The generalization of the result of this study from the sample of the study to other groupings with similar characteristics must be done with caution.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five (5) chapters; the first chapter contains the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, and limitations of the study. Chapter Two contains the literature review which was divided into three areas, namely, the introduction, the conceptual framework and the summary of the review. Chapter Three contains the methodology of the research and covers areas such as research design, population of the study, sample and sampling procedure, instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis plan. Chapter Four contains the results and discussion of the study. Chapter Five contains the summary including major findings, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The main focus of this chapter is to review existing literature on the state of teacher participation in school decision-making with specific focus on the level of teacher involvement in school decision-making, the school decision-making areas of teachers' involvement, the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making, the teachers' demographic characteristics that are associated with their involvement in school decision-making.

Level of Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making

Participative decision-making is perceived to have many meanings. Gregory and Ricky (1998) explained that participative decision-making is participative management while Lucey (1994) viewed it as the sharing of decision-making between the manager and the managed.

Tannanbaum and Schmidt (1958) noted that the level of employee participation in decision-making depends on the leadership style of the manager. Tannanbaum and Schmidt viewed leadership to involve a continuum of styles that starts from autocratic to democratic. They asserted that, as leadership style moves from autocratic to democratic, teacher participation in school decision-making increases. They further explained that this continuum embodies the various levels of teacher participation such as the announcement

of a decision, the sell of a decision, consultation, join decision-making, and delegation. This is corroborated by Mankoe (2002). Tannanbaum and Schmidt explained the various levels of teacher participation in decision-making as follows:

1. Announcement of decision: The superordinate [school head] makes the decision alone and announces it to the subordinates [teachers].

2. Sell of decision: The school head makes and solicits their support for its implementation.

3. Consultation: The school head presents the problem to his/her teachers, gets their suggestions and makes the final decision.

4. Joint decision-making: The school head presents the problem to his/her teachers, defines the authority and jointly takes the decision with them.

5. Delegation: The school head permits his/her teachers to make decisions within defined limits of authority in the pursuance of an assigned task.

Tannanbaum and Schmidt (1958), however, conceded that delegation is the highest form of participative decision-making in which teachers take full control of decision-making within defined limits of authority. This is followed by joint decision-making, consultation, sell of decision, and announcement of decision. They emphasized that selling of a decision to teachers is the least form of participation, and the announcement of a decision to teachers is an indication of the absence of participative decision-making.

They pointed out that announcement of a decision to teachers and teachers' absolute control of decision-making are two extreme styles, and the

styles in administrative practice are somewhere between the two. Gregory and Ricky (1998) however, pointed out that employee [teacher] involvement in school decision-making must go beyond mere consultation to joint decision-making and delegation. This would bring about increased teacher satisfaction, reduce group conflict and satisfy high order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization. This, in totality, increases teacher productivity. It is along this line that Lucey (1994), noted that there is some evidence that participative styles are associated with higher productive work group.

Finally, Tannanbaum and Schmidt (1958) concluded that the level of teacher participation in school decision-making hinged on the choice of leadership style, which also depends on the school head, the teacher, and the problem at hand. The school head's choice of leadership styles hinged on his/her values, inclination towards leadership, and the confidence he/she has in his/her teachers. On the issue of the teachers concerned, they explained that the teachers' need for responsibility, their knowledge of the problem, their interest and desire to participate in solving problems were accountable for the school head's choice of leadership style. Apart from these, the nature of the problem, the teachers' competence in solving the problem, and the time at hand for solving the problem are contributing factors that exert influence on the school head's choice of leadership style and the level of teacher participation. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) dilated that a school head's leadership style should be determined by the goals of the school and commitment of the teachers who work under him/her.

School Decision-Making Areas of Teacher Participation

The areas of school administration in which teachers participate in taking decisions are many. Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that both, teachers and school leaders, agree that faculty teachers [departmental teachers] participate frequently in decisions regarding formulation of goals/vision and mission of the school, standards of performance and discipline, spiritual matters, curriculum and instruction, and sometimes in decisions involving operations [management of school building], staff development, budgeting, facilitating structures, and seldom involvement in issue regarding staffing. Some authors (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978; Duodu, 2001; Mankoe, 2002; Ozigi, 1995) have divided these into six major decision-making areas, namely, curriculum and instruction, student matters, staffing, physical facilities, financial matters, and school-community relations. For the purpose of this study, the areas worth reviewing are curriculum and instructions, (b) student matters, (c) staffing, (d) physical facilities, (e) financial matters, and (f) school-community relations.

Curriculum and instruction involve what students learn and the activities that teachers and students do in order that students can learn what they are supposed to learn in school. These activities are embodied in the implementation of the school curriculum. In schools, curriculum implementation involves the activities that are performed to bring the subject content to the students. Because teachers are mostly engaged in the implementation of the school curriculum, they make decisions on the content of the curriculum, teaching and learning support materials, teaching methods

(methodologies), and assessment tools (Commonwealth Secretariat [CWS], 1993, Module 4).

On the issue of curriculum content, the government centrally decides and designs the curriculum with little or no input from the teachers at the school level (CWS, 1993, Module 4). Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) pointed out that such curriculum are usually imposed on teachers because of the poor training teachers received, the large percentage of non-professional [unregistered] teachers in the classrooms, the over-emphasis on teachers as technicians, and lack of insistence on ways of knowing in teacher education. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) further noted that until teachers stand up to these challenges, the curriculum will always be developed outside the classroom and imposed on them.

However, given the cultural diversity of some nations [such as Ghana], the content of the national curriculum must be interpreted and implemented to meet the needs of the students, community, and the nation as a whole (CWS, 1993, Module 4). Therefore, school heads and teachers must be involved in community activities in order to have adequate knowledge of the communities in which their respective schools are situated so as to be able to make a wide variety of satisfactory decisions in adapting the content and the national curriculum to meet the needs and abilities of the students and the communities as a whole (Adesina, 1990; Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978). The success of the implementation of the curriculum depends on the understanding and commitment that the teachers have towards the curriculum (Reid, Hopkins & Holly, 1990).

It is also observed that, at the school level, the success of any curriculum implementation process depends on the selection and application of the teaching methods. However, this is much influenced by the quality of the decisions, which the teachers make in the planning and implementation process as shown by the school timetable, the teachers' scheme of work, lesson plan, and lesson presentation in class (Reid, Hopkins & Holly, 1990).

Moreover, selecting and using the right teaching method without the appropriate teaching support materials may derail the success of the curriculum implementation process. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the teachers to decide which teaching and learning support materials are best needed for the implementation process. For instance, Pike and Selby (1990) noted that when selecting or developing any teaching and learning materials, they must not show any form of bias such as associated with ethnocentrism, racism and sexism either in explicit or implicit form. It is the duty of the teachers to decide which of these materials at their disposal meet these requirements as a teaching and learning support material for a given lesson.

This professional autonomy to decide what to teach to whom and how to teach has involved teachers much more in instructional decision-making. Teachers do not only make decisions in the preparation of their schemes of works and lesson plans, but they take decisions on students' assessment. They have to decide which form and tool of assessment results, therefore, serve as a basis for further instructional decision-making. This enormous demand requires teachers to be good decision makers because the success of the implementation process is largely determined by the quality of the decision they make.

On student matters, the heads of senior secondary schools are solely responsible for the admission, placement, orientation, and the discipline of students in their schools. They may assign these to others, but they still remain accountable to higher authority for the performance of these tasks (Ghana Education Service, 1994; Ozigi, 1995).

On issues of student admission, the school heads together with their teachers decide the total number of students to enroll in each academic year based on the physical facilities available and the students to teacher ratio among other factors prescribed by the Ghana Education Service. For instance, the Ghana Education Service has approved the admission of 500 students in each academic year per senior secondary school. However, those schools, which have the capacity to admit more than the approved quota and want to do so, have to apply to their respective Metropolitan, Municipal or District Director of Education for approval.

Another decision area of concern to senior secondary school heads and teachers is the placement and orientation of students. The placement of students into programmes of study in senior secondary schools is often done by the school heads. In some situations, this may be assigned to a placement and orientation committee. Pecku (1991) explained that such placement must be based on the students' abilities, interest, and career aspiration. Keller (1998) noted that this way the individuals will be best fitted for the occupation, which would give them most satisfaction. To attain this, Super and Knase (1981) earlier suggested that the individual must be helped to understand himself/herself in terms of his/her ability, interest, and personality

characteristics so as to be in a better position to choose and study a programme that would lead him/her to his/her occupation of interest.

It is along this line that Kellaway (1967), earlier explained that teachers should do their utmost to ensure selections are wisely made on the basis of students' ability to profit by further education. Equality of opportunity, if properly implemented should ensure that only those who have the necessary ability, aptitude and interest proceed to specific programmes.

However, since the inception of the computerized schools' selection and placement system [CSSPS] in September, 2005, students' placement into programmes and choices of school depends on their abilities irrespective of their interest, career aspiration, and economic background. For instance, a candidate's choice of a programme and school depends on his/her total score on English language, Mathematics, Integrated Science and Social Studies for senior secondary students or pre-technical skills for technical students and his/her best scores in two other subjects (Ministry of Education [MOEYS], 2005).

This system has shifted much of the decision-making on students' choice of programmes at the second cycle schools to the junior secondary school teachers and parents (MOEYS, 2005). This has left teachers in the secondary schools with the task of providing orientation services, maintaining discipline, and preparing students for specific programme at higher institutions. Placement, in Ackummey (2003) and Pecku's (1991) view, is often followed by orientation activities, which are meant to help students adjust to their new schools. Orientation gives the school heads and teachers

the opportunity to make collective decisions in identifying students' needs, planning activities and implementing them to aid students adjust to their new environment. Through such orientation, students are informed of the school's mission and goals, history, procedures, rules and regulations. They are, also shown the various facilities of the school and how and when to use them.

On issues of students' discipline, Adesina (1990) contended that many people have seen teachers as persons to whom students listen more than their parents. Others also view teachers as people who are in daily interaction with the students both inside and outside the classroom. Therefore, they understand the students better and can provide informed information on them.

This unique position of teachers gives them the chance to have the needed information on the causes of student indiscipline, and the best methods for combating such negative behavioural tendencies. It is this knowledge, which empowers teachers to participate in formulating and implementing the code of conduct for students in schools. Therefore, the teacher, as Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) earlier asserted becomes the primary initiator of discipline, which creates the atmosphere for learning.

Under the present system of education, senior secondary heads have very limited power on issues of staffing such as recruitment and appointment, training, promotion, and disciplining of teachers. In the area of recruitment of teachers, school heads can only recruit teachers for their respective schools based on approval from the Metropolitan, Municipal or District Director of Education. However, the Director-General of Education, the Metropolitan, Municipal and District Director of Education are responsible for recruitment

and appointment of teachers based on recommendation from the school heads (Ghana Education Service Council, 2000).

It is against such background that the President's Committee on Review of Education Reforms in Ghana recommended that senior secondary school heads should be involved in the selection of teachers for their respective schools (Government of Ghana, 2002). Adesina (1990) observed that such involvement will enable school heads to select teachers who can contribute meaningfully to the success of their schools. Also, Sabo, Barnes, Hoy (1996) noted that, apart from budgeting, hiring of teachers is a decision-making area where teachers are highly deprived.

One other issue is the professional development of teachers. The Ghana Education Service has often organized a number of workshops, seminars and training sessions for teachers in public schools. However, the topics of these in-service training programmes are usually perceived as the needs of teachers while, in reality, they do not represent the teachers' needs (Ghana Education Service, 1994). Therefore, the teachers gain little or nothing from such training programmes. For such topics to be of benefits to teachers, it is very important for teachers to identify their own teaching and learning needs and agree upon them as worth a place in their in-service training programme (Ministry of Education, 2003). Purkey and Smith (1985) earlier pointed out that such needs should be a collaborative solution to the schools' problems.

Currently, such in-service trainings are not even organized for senior school teachers. This is corroborated by the President's Committee on Review

of Education Reforms in Ghana. This committee observed that teachers are promoted to management positions without receiving any form of in-service training (Government of Ghana, 2002). This observation buttressed the assertion earlier made that, in Africa, people are selected to the position of headship of secondary schools or training colleges for the reason that they are good teachers, they are academically good, they have taught for sometime or they have good connections with authority (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978).

Farrant (1980) noted that such leaders are authoritarians and pay no attention to staff development or training. Consequently, teachers under them who are promoted to leadership position often lack the requisite experience to function adequately. To combact this, Ozigi (1995) advised that school heads should encourage their teachers to attend professional meetings, conferences, and workshops to enhance their professional development. Duodu (2001) explained that this is necessary because the success or failure of a school to a great extent depends on the quality of its leadership.

Senior secondary school heads depend on the Director-General of Education, Regional Director, Metropolitan, Municipal, and the District Director of Education for the promotion of their teachers (Ghana Education Service, 2001). These heads only recommend their teachers to the appropriate body for consideration. This recommendation must be largely based on the teachers' actual performance evaluation result but, in many cases, it is based on the school heads' subjective assessment of their teachers' performance without any institutionalized performance evaluation system in place. As a result, many teachers are promoted based on their number of years in the teaching profession and their academic qualifications (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978).

This is corroborated by Hwangbo (1996). Hwangbo (1996) found that a strong relationship exists between posting of individuals to leadership post and the number of years of service in the teaching profession. Although this study is done in a different cultural setting, indications are that this finding is likely to be true in Ghana. Adesina (1990) noted that such promotion often puts the credibility of the leadership into doubt and can plunge the whole school system into chaos.

Due to the invaluable contribution of performance evaluation results in making any teacher promotion system credible, there is the need for school heads to largely base their recommendations on teachers' performance evaluation results instead of their subjective judgment. For any performance evaluation system to work successfully, teachers must be actively involved in deciding and implementing it (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1993, Module 3: Ozigi, 1995). Also, they must be informed that recommendations for their promotion are largely to be based on their performance reports in addition to serving the prescribed years and possessing the requisite qualifications.

Moreover, they must know that all reports on promotions are confidential, and this must be kept truly as such (Ozigi, 1995). One of the main responsibilities of the senior secondary school head is to maintain discipline among staff by enforcing the code of conduct for teachers. This code, as spelt out in part three of the condition and scheme of service and code of conduct for teachers of the Ghana Education Service is a collective agreement between the employer and the teachers of the public schools in Ghana. (Ghana Education Service [GES], 2001).

However, these heads lack adequate authority to sanction violators of this code. It is for this reason that the President's committee on review of education reforms in Ghana recommended that secondary school heads should be given adequate authority, which commensurate with their responsibilities so that they can play the supervisory role effectively as managers especially on issues of staff discipline (Government of Ghana, 2002).

Since the inception of the 1961 Education Act, the state and its allies such as the Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies are responsible for the provision and major maintenance of classrooms, workshops, laboratories, equipments, libraries, sanitary facilities, staff houses, school furniture, teachers' textbooks and stationery among others while school heads and teachers are responsible for their use and minor maintenance (Sekyere, 1998). Moreover, these school heads and their teachers have no say in the provision of these facilities except they make an appeal to the community or other bodies for help or raise their own funds to undertake their own projects.

Furthermore, the community, which involves the traditional rulers and their people, the Parent -Teacher Association, Old Students Association, and the Board of Governors of school, may also supplement the state's efforts in the provision of educational facilities. However, the management [use and maintenance] of such facilities is left to the school heads and their teachers. Most often, in schools, the heads usually assigned this task to the school maintenance committee under the chairmanship of the senior house tutor (Ozigi, 1995). Reid, Hopkins and Holly (1990) noted that a good school is one that maintains an orderly and safe environment for students and teachers.

Sergiovanni and Starrant (1998) pointed out that such school environment improves students' performance.

On financial matters, the heads of senior secondary schools are responsible for determining and mobilizing financial resources to meet the expenditure requirements of their schools. A large percentage of these funds are usually obtained from the central government in the form of grants (Duodu, 2001; Mankoe, 2002). Also, the individual school may obtain funds from the local authorities such as the Metropolitan, Municipality, or District Assembly. Some funds may be obtained from the community or raised from internally generated sources. (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1993, Module 5). School heads, consequently, are accountable to the funding bodies for all money and other resources received and expended.

This accountability often takes the form of proper recording of all money received and spent according to the laid down financial guidelines and presenting these records for auditing by institutional and state auditors to ensure that the money is effectively and efficiently used as stipulated by the Financial Administration Act, 2003 (Act 654) (Government of Ghana, 2003). In spite of this, school heads could assign the daily receipt and payment of money to their bursars/accountant while remaining accountable for all money received and payments made (Ozigi, 1995).

Apart from this, school heads, according to Duodu (2001), must ensure that all sections and departments are consulted and their needs incorporated in the school budget. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) explained that this is necessary to avert the uncertainty that marks budget estimates. Sabo, Barnes and Hoy

(1996) noted that budgeting is a decision-making area where teachers are highly deprived. This is due to lack of transparency in the financial management of schools. As a result, there is a great deal of disaffection among staff (Government of Ghana, 2002). Asiedu-Akrofi, however, cautioned that school heads and bursars should not monopolize preparation of budget estimate because the teachers who use the equipments and other supplies in the classrooms, laboratories and workshop will be in a better position to advise them.

Under PNDC Law 207, both boarding and day senior secondary schools are community-based and, under this concept, communities are to assist the Schools set and achieve their performance target (Mankoe, 2002). Therefore, the school heads and their teachers must initiate and nurture strong relationship with these communities in which their respective schools are situated in order to win their support (Farrant, 1980).

This relationship, according to Mankoe (2002), can be established through the involvement of members of the community in school activities such as the school's Speech and Prize Giving Day, Parent Teacher Association, and the school Board of Governors among others. Also, the teachers of the secondary schools should actively participate in community activities such as clean-up campaign, health education, and festivals. Farrant (1980) noted that, this way, schools can play their role as sub-units of their respective communities in training the youth. To achieve this, school heads and their teachers must come together as a family and share common tasks.

In the review of literature on school decision-making areas of teacher involvement, the dimensions worth investigating are curriculum and instruction, student matters, staffing, physical facilities, financial matters, and school-community relationship. The present study was, therefore, interested in finding out the extent to which teachers participated in these variables in decision-making.

Ways of Involving Teachers in School Decision-Making

The involvement of teachers in school decision-making can take a variety of ways. Lucey (1994) explained that, in industrial organizations, workers can formally and informally participate in management decision-making through consultation including meeting, joint-management-employee committee, work council, representation on the Board of Directors, and full or partial ownership of the institution. Unlike Lucey (1994), Ozigi (1995) conceded that these ways in educational institutions, include delegation, staff meeting, teamwork, and teacher representation on school board, consultation and suggestion box. Moreover, in many institutions, a great deal of decision-making is achieved via committees and task forces. Also, Gregory and Ricky (1998) pointed out that the best ways of involving workers [teachers] in decision-making are team work and delegation. In the light of this, the key dimensions worth reviewing are delegation, school meeting, teacher representation in school committee and school board of governors.

Delegation is a way of employing employees [teachers] to take part in institutional [school] decision-making. This is done when school heads

transfer some of their authority to perform a task that they would have performed themselves to their teachers. This transfer gives the teachers the right to make decisions in the pursuance of the assigned task without reference to higher level for decisions. That is, the teachers take their own work decisions and act upon them rather than relying on their school heads for such decisions. Consequently, the teachers' capacity to make and implement their own decisions with higher degree of commitment and confidence is developed. This enables teachers to keep their schools running in the absence of their heads (Dublin, 1997; Laid & Laid, 1987).

Apart from the transfer of some authority to make decisions, delegation goes beyond to define the boundary for this decision-making, for instance,

> such decisions should be made at the lowest possible
>
> level which accords with their nature and as closed to the
>
> scene of action as possible. They should always be
>
> taken at the level which ensures none of the activities and
>
> objectives affected is forgotten (Drucker as cited in
>
> Lucey, 1994, p.108).

Therefore, delays in decision-making is reduced and participation is encouraged.Also, delegation makes it mandatory upon the superior [school heads] to ensure that teachers to whom a task is assigned is given the needed resources and briefing, advice, training and / or guidance to enable him/her

perform the task to set standards. It is also obligatory for the manager [school heads] to demand accountability of performance from the employees [teachers]. Without this, delegation is meaningless (Laid & Laid, 1987; Lucey, 1994).

In addition, it is the responsibility of the school head to ensure that the performance standards are met when a task is assigned. Therefore, some form of control is needed. This must be done together with the teachers. Control of performance must be linked to performance results. It should not interfere with the teachers' means of achieving the set standards except that things are going out of rails. Without the right form of control, delegation is often the equivalent of neglect of duty (Dublin, 1997; Laid & Laid, 1987).

However, when the school head tends to control the ways in which the work is done [the means] instead of the results [the ends], they have no trust and confidence in their teachers. This is because delegation is the assignment of trust and confidence the school heads have in their teachers' capabilities. Also, this trust and confidence must be based on the teachers' knowledge and interest in taking up and executing the assigned task instead of favouritism (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1993, Module 2; Laid & Laid, 1987). Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) earlier saw this to be necessary because a school head's confidence in his/her staff is a requirement for high quality performance.

The end result of delegation is the establishment of an organization structure, which is always made visibly by a chart. Without delegation, there is no structure. This structure usually shows who is responsible for what and the directions in which the school heads can assign tasks and authority

(Dublin, 1997; Mullins, 1996). In schools where delegation exists, school heads do not feel pressed for time to perform their daily activities. In addition, they do not take a long time to get a simple job done. Apart from these, activities in the schools do not slow down or come to a halt in the absence of the school heads or do the teachers always wait for the school heads' instructions before they can perform their duties. This is because every role in the structure of the school is clearly defined by a responsibility schedule (Ghana Education Service, 2001).

School meetings provide teachers the opportunity to take part in school decision-making. These decisions usually embody on timetable, staff duties, equipments and student matters among other things and may take the form of briefly meeting, discussion meetings, and problem-solving meetings. Such meetings can be classified as emergence or periodic meetings. Periodic meetings are more formal but emergency meetings are less formal and may be held when the need arises (Mankoe, 2002; Ozigi, 1995). The frequency, quorum, and management of these meetings have a greater influence on teacher participation in them.

The number of times these meetings are held in a given term or year increases the likelihood of greater involvement of teachers. Teachers who failed to attend the previous meeting may seize a second meeting as an opportunity to participate. However, Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) noted that frequent staff meetings are as bad as infrequent ones, even though they may be held for some reasons. Ozigi (1995) therefore, explained that staff meetings could be held at the beginning, the middle and the end of each term.

Apart from the frequency of the meeting, the quorum is an important factor. The quorum is the minimum number of persons required to hold a meeting as specified by rules. The greater the quorum present at a meeting, the greater the pooled have diversed knowledge for decision-making. The decisions made in such meetings are likely to be more qualitative than those made by individuals. In fact many research works have shown that quality of decisions improves as the decision-making process moves from the individual to a group level (Lucey, 1994).

Also, without, proper planning and organization, a good quorum and maximum participation can not be attained irrespective of the times a meeting is convened. Therefore, the participation of teachers in school meetings largely depends on how well the meeting is planned and organized. A well-planned meeting is one whose members are pre-informed of the agenda, time and venue of the meeting and are given the opportunity to submit other issues for incorporation as agenda items and as well given the opportunity to participate. In addition, it must be one, which is properly convened (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978; Lucey, 1994).

Moreover, a well-organized meeting must be one that is well controlled such that order is maintained. Every teacher is given the chance to speak while ensuring no one or group dominates the discussions. Motions, voting, amendments, and point of order are properly handled to the benefit of all members without any bias and favouritism. Also, deliberations are fully exhausted to enable teachers make informed decisions on every issue. Decisions are arrived at compromised consensus and clarified for all records.

This democratic procedure makes it obligatory for all teachers to accept and commit themselves to implementing such decisions (Mankoe, 2002).

After the meeting, minutes must be prepared, signed and distributed in time to all members. The final decisions reached at the meeting should be implemented so that teachers can see that their contributions at meeting are important to the success of the school. This will urge them to attend and participate in subsequent meetings (Lucey, 1994: Ozigi, 1995). However, when there is a change in any final decision taken at a meeting, the school head must explain to the teachers why a decision has been changed before it is implemented.

If this is not done, the attitudes of those teachers who valued participative decision-making may be undermined while those of who questioned participative decision-making would be enforced (Taylor & Tashakkoror, 1997).

Teachers of senior secondary schools are sometimes engaged in school decision-making via committee systems. In schools, there are usually varieties of committees set up for different tasks. These committee may be standing or adhoc ones. The standing committees can take the form of food committee, discipline committee, sport and entertainment committee, time-tabling committee, welfare committee, and academic board among others. The school may also set up adhoc committee to handle problems that arise and need immediate attention (Mankoe, 2002).

The existence, composition and sitting of these committees are indicators of teacher involvement in school administration. The role of these

committees must be clearly outlined. Also, all members of the teaching staff must be engaged in at least, one or two committees in addition to their duties. This way all teachers would be given the opportunity to fully participate in school decision-making. Therefore, the diverse talents of the teachers are maximized to the benefits of the school. This is also necessary not to over burden some teachers while others have nothing doing (Mankoe, 2002; Ozigi 1995).

Under the community-based school management concept of the 1987 Education reforms, the public is encouraged to participate in the management of schools through the school Board of Governors. These Boards are responsible for overseeing the management of the school under their jurisdiction. The composition of each board makes its mandatory for teacher representation in its deliberations as a member (Ghana Education Service, 2003). This representation affords teachers the opportunity to make policy decisions that affect them and their students (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1993, Module 7; Ozigi, 1995).

From the review of literature on ways of involving teachers in school decision-making, it is clear that the main ways of involving teachers in school decision-making include delegation, school meeting, and teacher representation in school committee and school Board of Governors. The current study was, consequently, interested in identifying the variables with which teachers were associated in decision-making

**Teachers' Demographic Characteristics and Teachers' Participation in
School Decision Areas**

Recently, much of literature has sought to associate teacher's demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, academic qualification, teaching experience, professional rank and years of service in present school, with their active participation in some decision areas of school administration. Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that there is no evidence that the variable (gender, age, years of service in the same school) are significantly associated with the actual level of faculty [departmental] teachers' participation in share decision-making. On matters of gender, Brown (1996) reported a similar finding. Trotter (1996) also, found that teachers with fewer years of service (1-5 years) in the same school show no higher level of involvement in decision-making than their colleagues who have been in the school for six years or more.

On the issue of age, Owen as cited in Mankoe (2002) pointed out that young teachers are much interested in school policies, rules, subject content, methodology, and evaluation of their performance while old teachers are interested in taking key decisions affecting the school including the maintenance of school tradition. Also, Trotter (1996) reported that younger teachers perceive themselves to be more involved in the areas of budgeting, operation of school, and facilitating procedures and structures while veteran teachers indicate the highest involvement in the areas of standards, and curriculum and instruction.

Another area of concern is teachers' academic qualification. Some researchers found that respondents with baccalaureate degree [advanced level certificate] show greater involvement in decisions related to operation of secondary school than their colleagues with master's degree (Kuku & Taylor, 2002). This finding runs contrary to that of Hwangbo (1996). Hwangbo found that teachers with higher educational qualifications desire more participation in share decision-making than their colleagues with lower qualifications.

In area of teaching experience, one author explained that experienced and inexperienced teachers in a secondary school may have different views about participation in specific decision-making areas (Owens as cited in Mankoe, 2002). Example, in the North Philippines, Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that teachers who have been in the profession for 11-20 years are more actively involved in matters regarding curriculum and instruction and staff development than their colleagues with less years of teaching experience. Rusch and Perry (1999), however, cautioned that while experience can be a vital requisite to leadership position, individuals with longer service records can become very structured, inflexible, and at times reluctant to share power for fear of taking risk, and changing roles and responsibilities.

The review of literature on teacher' demographic characteristics and participation in school decision-making revealed that teachers' gender, age, academic qualification, teaching experience, and years of service in present school are sometimes associated with their participation in school decision-making. The present study was, therefore, interested in finding out whether these variables were important in decision-making in the schools studied.

35

Factors which Influence Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making

There are numerous factors responsible for teacher participation in school decision-making. In the North Philippines, Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that teachers' participation in share decision-making activities is important for increased professionalism, school improvement, better school morale, and increased job satisfaction. Some authors have dilated that such involvement increases job satisfaction, job commitment, job involvement, and innovativeness (Hezberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959, Lucey, 1994; Cameron & Whetten, 1995). Also, Sergiovani and Starratt (1993) saw teachers' job satisfaction, profession development, job commitment, job involvement, and innovativeness as motivating conditions in successful schools.

Mankoe (2002) also pointed out that the individual teacher's willingness to participate and the administrative principles are contributing factors. For the purpose of this study, the variables worth reviewing are job satisfaction, profession development, job commitment, innovativeness, teacher's desire to participate, and administrative principles.

In reviewing existing literature on participative decision-making in industrial and educational organizations, some early human relation theorists have argued that employees [teachers], who successfully participate in making a decision, implementing it, and achieving the desired outcomes, satisfied their needs for achievement. In addition, beyond this satisfaction, they are provided with recognition, responsibility, and enhanced self-esteem (Gregory & Ricky, 1998).

Hezberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959) earlier noted these needs to be motivators, which increase job satisfaction and are the things for which employees work to attain in pursuit of the goals of an organization. For instance, in their study of work experience and attitude of employees involving a sample of two hundred and three accountants and engineers drawn from firms in Pittsburgh in the United States, Hezberg and his colleagues asked the employees to rank the following fourteen job-related factors in order of important relative to motivation: sense of achievement, earning of recognition, interest in the work itself, opportunity for growth, opportunity for advancement, importance of responsibility, relationship with peer and group, pay for work done, fairness of supervisor, policies and rules of company, status of job, security of job friendliness of supervisor, and condition of working.

Hezberg, et al. (1959) concluded that work itself, achievement, recognition, responsibility, opportunity for growth and advancement are job-related motivators [satisfiers], which provided job satisfaction and are things for which employees work to attain. Hezberg and his colleagues however stated that company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal conditions and salary are job-environment factors [dissatisfies], which do not motivate but can cause job dissatisfaction if they are not present in the accepted standards.

One criticism of this conclusion is that Hezberg, et al. (1959) only concentrate on the study of satisfaction and dissatisfaction   but failed to consider other behavioural factors such as performance, absenteeism, and labour turn-over. However, other researchers such as Maslow (1943) as cited

in Lucey (1994) argued that both job-content motivators and environmental factors do separately contribute to job satisfaction. It is for this reason that Burke and Bittel (1981) cited employee participation in decision-making as a motivator, which makes employees more active in improving their own performance and that of others. In all, Mankoe (2002) noted that teachers' participation in decision-making is positively associated to teachers' satisfaction with the teaching profession.

Apart from the motivational effect, employees including teachers who participate in decision-making enhance their professionalism. Professionalism, according to Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), is one's ability and willingness to seek one's own effectiveness through self-improvement. As a result, when teachers are involved in the complete process of decision-making, they are likely to acquire some experience, which would put them in a better position to make work decisions for themselves without overburdening their superior's [school head's] for advice or slow down work in the absence of their school heads. Also, they build their professional competence for higher responsibilities, Wesley (1991) noted that the best way teachers can influence their professional practices is to spend some time learning and working with their colleagues. Ozigi (1995) saw this as the best way in which the quality and strength of the contribution of the teachers can impact significantly on the success of the school.

The participation of teachers in senior secondary school decision-making increases their commitment to the final decision made and its implementation. This is because they do not want their decision to fail in achieving its objective. In addition, they usually implement such decision

with greater speed and effectiveness to attain the expected results (Lucey, 1994). As a result, substantial decrease in time is required in implementing such a decision (Cameron & Whetten, 1995). In this sense, teacher involvement in school decision-making is seen as a powerful "anti-dote" against complacency and failure [of decision implementation] in any institution (Plunkett & Fournier, 1996).

Smylie (1996) explained that teachers' involvement in school activities can be achieved through teacher participation in school decision-making. Such involvement usually creates a democratic culture which, over time, makes the school a true community in which teachers are treated with respect and trust. Teachers, in turn, become ideologically and culturally committed to act in the best interest of the institution with a true sense of ownership. This was, also, earlier noted by Cascio (1986). Cosgrave (1975) earlier noted that such employees [teachers] usually see their work as a central part of their life. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), also explained that such employment of talents makes the teachers feel as being parties to the school administrative process and a basis for high quality work in schools.

Secondary schools which involve teachers in decision-making encourage innovativeness. In these schools, teachers look more professional and are willing to change, adapt, and try new things (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978; Smylie, 1996). This was corroborated by Reid, Hopkins and Holly (1990) when they asserted that tolerance for failure, encouragement of experimentation, and the capacity to invent and adapt are the hallmarks of innovative schools, and they never traded off effectiveness for efficiency. In such schools, the teacher support one another and value individual's strength

and uniqueness. They also believe they can do their jobs. These ideas are supported by Abdal-Haqq (1998). Abdal-Haqq noted that teachers who participate in school decision-making are more willing to take instructional risks and experiment with new ideas. As a result, there is continuous improvement in classroom practice and the overall performance of the students. Asiedu-Akrofi had earlier observed these to be the fundamental characteristics of a good school and a good learning environment. Asiedu-Akrofi further explained that such characteristics promote the teachers' sense of responsibility for good work, which becomes an integral part of the school culture.

Mankoe (2002) observed that the teachers' willingness to participate in school decision-making depends on their zone of indifference, acceptance, sensitivity, and ambivalence. On the issue of the teachers' zone of indifference, Mankoe explained that this includes all decisions, which do not directly concern the teachers. Therefore, they do not involve themselves in making decisions in those areas. Unlike the zone of indifference, the zone of acceptance involves school decisions' areas in which teachers are willingly and committed to participate in making decisions. These areas involve the scheme of work, method of teaching, teaching and learning support material, student discipline, academic calendar and other curricular activities.

In the case of the teachers' zone of sensitivity, the teacher gets much involved because their personal interest is at stake. These decision areas involve their teaching assignments and evaluation of their performance in school. On the aspect of the teachers' zone of ambivalence, Mankoe noted that it embodies areas in which teachers have personal interest, but which are

not strong enough to get them involved in decision-making. These may include preparing for professional conference, scheduling an assembly or organizing fund raising activities such as speech and prize-giving day. Mankoe, however, conceded that these zones are issues worth considering in guiding senior secondary school administrators in deciding the level of teachers' participation in school decision-making, but each problem should be carefully examined to determine the participation that is required.

Regarding matters of administrative principles, Owens as cited in Mankoe (2002) emphasized that the participation of teachers in school decision-making depends on three administrative principles, namely, the test of relevance, the test of expertise, and the test of jurisdiction. On the issue of test of relevance, he conceded that teachers involve themselves in making decisions, in which their personal interests are at stake. These decisions usually border on teaching method, teacher support material, discipline, curriculum and instruction.

Also, the interest of the individual teacher may be a contributing factor. However, without the expertise, the teachers' participation in school decision-making is worthless. As a result, the teachers' competency is a significant factor in finding the solution to a problem. In addition, without the authority to make decisions, the teachers may have their interest at stake and the needed expertise to contribute, yet they can not participate in making decisions outside the operational areas of their jurisdiction in the authority structure of school without invitation. Therefore, the extent of their participation in school decision-making depends largely on their areas of

operational jurisdiction as defined by administrative policies, regulations, and procedures.

Some authors argued that the individual teachers' willingness to participate in school decision-making and the administrative principles are not the only contributing factors. The decision-making style also matters. For instance, in their leadership model, Vroom-Jago (as cited in Gregory and Ricky, 1998) prescribed that the involvement of subordinates [teachers] in decision-making is much determined by factors such as the importance the superordinate [school head], attached to the quality of the decision, the decision commitment of the teachers, the availability of sufficient information needed to make a quality decision, the extent to which the problem is well structured, the degree commitment of the teachers to the decision if it were made by the school head, the commitment of the teachers to the achievement of the decision objectives, the degree of difference over preferred solution to the problem, and the sufficiency of available information to teachers for making a quality decision.

In the review of literature on factors which influence teacher involvement in school decision-making, job satisfaction, professional development, job commitment, job involvement, innovativeness, teachers' desire to participate, administrative principles, and the decision-making style of the school head featured as dominant dimensions worth investigating. The present study, therefore, tried to find out how these variables were associated with teacher participation in decision-making.

Summary

In recent times, stakeholders in education have advocated teacher participation in school decision-making as a management approach to increasing the academic performance of students in schools (Government of Ghana, 2002). This advocacy is supported by studies that indicated that teacher participation in school decision-making leads to improve academic achievement for students (Atakpa & Ankomah, 1998; Smylie, 1998).

Literature was reviewed on the level of teachers' participation in school decision-making, the school decision-making areas of teachers' participation, the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making, the teachers' demographic characteristics that are associated with their participation in school decision-making, and the factors that influence teachers' participation in school decision-making.

On the level of teacher participation in school decision-making, Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) noted that the degree of employee [teacher] participation in decision-making depends on the leadership style of the manager [school head]. Tannenbaum and Schmidt viewed leadership to involve styles, which are ranged in a continuum from autocratic, and as leadership style moves towards democratic style, the level of teacher participation in decision-making increases.

Tannenbaum and his colleague noted such levels of participation to include the school head: selling a decision to the teachers to solicit their support for its implementation; announcing the decision to the teachers to solicit their support for its implementation; consulting the teachers for their

views on an issue before taking the final decision; jointly taking a decision with the teachers or transferring some authority to the teachers to take decision [in some areas of school administration].

The main decision-making areas of school administration, according to Ozigi (1995) and Mankoe (2002) are curriculum and instruction, student matters, staffing, physical facilities, financial matters, and school-community relations. These are corroborated by Kuku and Taylor (2002).

Ozigi (1995) conceded that, in an educational institution, teachers are involved in these school decision-making areas, via delegation, staff meeting, consultation, suggestion box, teacher representation in school committee and school Board. Moreover, Gregory and Ricky (1998) argued that the best way of involving workers [teachers] in decision-making are teamwork and delegation. Others authors are of the view that a great deal of participative decision-making is achieved through committee and task force.

On matters of teachers' demographic characteristics and participation in school decision-making areas, Kuku and Taylor (2002) found no evidence that the variable-gender, age, and years of service in the same school-are significantly associated with perceptions of the actual level of teachers' participation in shared decision-making. However, current studies revealed that teachers' demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, academic qualification, teaching experience, and years of service in present school, are associated with their participation in school decision-making.

On matters of gender, Kuku and Taylor (2002) found no support for male/female difference regarding decision-making. Brown (1996) also

corroborated such finding. However, on the issue of age, Owen as cited in Mankoe (2002) noted that young teachers are much interested in school policies, rules, subject content, methodology, and evaluation of their performance, and the old teachers are interested in making key decisions including maintenance of school tradition.

Moreover, on the issue of teachers' academic qualification, Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that respondents with baccalaureate degree [advance level certificates] show greater involvement in decisions related to operations of the school than their colleagues with master's degrees. This finding runs contrary to that of Hwangbo, (1996). Hwangbo, (1996) found that teachers with higher educational qualifications desire more participation in share decision-making than their colleagues with lower qualifications.

On the area of teaching experience, Owen as cited in Mankoe, (2002) indicated that experience and inexperience teachers in a school may have different views about participation in specific decision areas. Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that teachers who have been in the profession for 11-20 years are more actively involved on matters regarding curriculum and instruction and staff development than their colleagues with less years of teaching experiences. However, Rusch and Perry (1999) cautioned that while experience can be a vital prerequisite to leadership positions, individuals with longer services records can become very structured, inflexible, and at times reluctant to share power for fear of risk losing power, and changing role and responsibility.

On the issue of factors influencing teachers participation in school decision-making, some authors argued that the participation of teachers in school decision-making process increases their job satisfaction, morale, professionalism, job commitment, innovativeness, desire to participate (Cameron & Whetten,1995; Hezberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959; Kuku & Taylor, 2002; Lucey, 1994; Mankoe, 2002) and other dimensions such as administrative principles and decision-making style of school head (Mankoe, 2002; Vroom-Yetton-Jago as cited in Gregory & Ricky, 1998).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

I sought to describe, in this chapter, the research methodology employed in this study by spelling out the research design, the population of the study, the sample of the study, the sampling procedure, the instrument used to gather data, data collection procedure, and the data analysis. This study is to find out the state of teacher participation in public Senior High School decision-making in the Kadjebi District. The study is to identify school decision-making areas of teacher participation, ways of involving teachers in school level decision-making, teachers' demographic characteristics that are associated with their participation in school decision-making and factors that influence teachers' participation in school decision-making.

Research Design

This study is a descriptive survey of the state of teachers' participation in school decision-making in the Kadjebi District. A descriptive survey is an attempt to describe what exists at the moment among a group of people (Roger & Joseph, 1983). Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) defined descriptive survey as an attempt to describe existing conditions among a group of people. I chose this design because it is the most appropriate design for measuring the characteristics of people (Babbie, 1983). It, also, allows the collection of data by examining many variables with the use of questionnaires (Roger & Joseph,

1983). Apart from these, Babbie noted that descriptive survey provides the researcher the opportunity to sample a population, which would have been too large to observe directly for study.

In spite of these strengths, the descriptive survey design has some weaknesses. It involves the conceptualization and operationalisation of variables in order to create measuring instruments. This poses a major threat to the validity and reliability of the instruments of the study because the attributes of some variables studied are not stable over time (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). In addition, such attributes are not always exhaustive and mutually exclusive to precision (Babbie, 1983). However, I still view descriptive survey as the most appropriate design for this study because of the variables involved and its enormous strength in generalizing from a sample to a population.

Population

The population of the study consisted of teachers in public senior secondary schools in the Kadjebi district who, as at the 2009/2010 school session, numbered 123. Out of this number, the target population was 116 professional teachers who had had six or more months of teaching experience in their current schools as at September 2010. The accessible population comprised teachers from the target population who were at post during the study period. They were chosen because it was my belief that teachers with six or more months of teaching experience have enough exposure in the

operations of the schools. Therefore, such teachers were in a better position to answer the research questionnaires honestly.

A sampling frame of the accessible population was drawn from the registers of the 2009/2010 Ghana Education Service teacher population census of the schools. The drawn sampling frame consisted of 116 professional teachers. Out of this number, 32 were teachers of Dodi-Papase Senior High Technical School, 54 were teachers in Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School while the remaining 30 were teachers of Ahamansu Islamic Senior High School. These schools are located in Dodi-Papase, Kadjebi and Ahamansu in the district.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The sample of the study consisted of 99 professional teachers with six or more months of teaching experience in public senior high schools in the Kadjebi district as at September 2010. This group of teachers constituted 85% of the accessible population. My choice of this sample size was influenced by the assertion of Fraenkel and Wallen (2000). Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) explained that a sample with a minimum of 90 cases was necessary for descriptive studies if any meaningful inferences were to be drawn from the sample in order to generalize the accessible population. The sample was selected by means of proportional stratified probability sampling and simple random sampling. These sampling techniques were employed to ensure that any key characteristics of the individual cases in the population were included in the sample (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000).

The accessible population of 116 teachers was first divided into homogenous strata based on school and on sex according to sampling fractions as shown in Table 1. The sampling fraction of each school was obtained by dividing the number of teachers in the concerned school by the accessible population. The sampling fraction obtained for each school was then multiplied by the sample for the study (99) to obtain the proportionally allotted sample per school. For instance, the proportional sample size for Dodi-Papase Senior High Technical School was obtained by dividing 32 by 116 and multiplying the result by 99. This gave 27 teachers.

Also, sample size of teachers per attributes of sex for each school was further stratified into proportional samples of attributes of sex (male and female) per school. This was obtained by dividing the number of teachers per each attribute of sex per school by the accessible population to obtain the sampling fraction for each attribute of sex per school. The result was then multiplied by the sample of the study to obtain the proportional sample size per attribute of sex per school. For example, the proportional sample of male teachers allotted to Dodi-Papase Senior High Technical School was obtained by dividing 22 by 116 and multiplying the result by 99. This gave 19 male teachers.

The names of various teachers in each sex stratum per school were assigned cardinal numbers (such as 1, 2, 3, 4...). These were written on pieces of paper and placed in a paper box. Thirty students of form three of Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School were invited to pick a piece of paper from the box once at a time. The pieces of papers in the box were thoroughly mixed before

another student was invited to pick again. Each piece of paper picked from the box represented a case of the sample to be studied.

This continued until the proportional sample size was obtained for each attribute (stratum) of sex per school. This sampling procedure was applied to all strata of sex of the schools to obtain the samples for the schools. The individual samples per strata of sex per school were then merged into one constituting the sample of the study.

Since the various strata differed in size, the teachers were allotted to each stratum proportionally to the number of teachers in each attribute of sex per school. This gave each teacher an equal chance of being included in the sample of study. Table 1 shows the distribution of proportional samples by school and sex and the distribution of teacher population by school and by sex.

Table 1

Distribution of Proportional Samples of Teachers by School and Sex

Name of School	Sample per school	Sample by gender	
		Male	Female
Dodi-Papase Sen. High Tech Sch.	27 (32)	19 (22)	8 (10)
Kadjebi-Asato Sen.High Sch.	46 (54)	27 (32)	19 (22)
Ahamansu Islamic Sen. High Sch.	26 (30)	22 (26)	4 (4)

Table 1 cont'd

Total	99 (116)	68 (80)	31 (36)

Figures in bracket represent population by school and gender

Instruments

The principal instruments used in this study were two sets of questionnaires. One set of questionnaire was for teachers and the other was for school heads. The teachers' questionnaire had 52 items (See Appendix A) and the school heads' questionnaire had 16 items (See Appendix B).

The teachers' questionnaire is in five sections. The first section contains five items, which measure the level of teacher participation in school decision-making. The respondents were asked to rank the items according to their occurrence in the day-to-day administration of their respective schools as follows: 1st - very often, 2nd - often, 3rd - least often and 4th - never.

The second section contains a modified version of Russell, Copper and Greenblatt's (1992) teacher involvement and participation scale [tips] which measures teachers' involvement in the following school decision-making areas: curriculum and instruction, student matters, staffing, operation/physical facilities, and school-community relationship. This scale is modified to suit the Ghanaian context. It is a five-point Likert-type scale, which contains eleven items.

These items are divided into six sub-sections: curriculum and instruction [items 6 and 7], student matters [items 8 and 9], staffing [items 10 and 11], operation/physical facilities [items 12 and 13], and school-community relationship [items 14, 15, and 16]. The items of each sub-sections are rated as "strongly agree", "agree", "uncertain", "disagree", and "strongly disagree". However, two alternative response items [items 17 & 18] were added to this section of the questionnaire to ascertain teachers' involvement in school financial matters. These additional items were rated as "yes" or "no".

The third section of the questionnaire contains ten items, which measure teachers' involvement in school decision-making via delegation, school meeting, school board, and school committee. Delegation has three alternative response items [19, 20, and 21], which are rated as either "yes" or "no". Also, the school meeting scale has three Likert-type items [22, 23, and 24], which are rated as "strongly agree", "agree", "uncertain", "disagree", and "strongly disagree".

On the issue of teacher involvement in school decision-making via school Board, two items [25 and 26] are rated as "yes" or "no". A dimension such as school committee has two multiple response items [27 and 28] whose responses are as follows: none, discipline committee, food committee, entertainment committee, academic board, procurement committee, and other(s).

The fourth section of the questionnaire used factors influencing teacher participation in school decision-making scale [fitps] I designed to ascertain factors which influence teacher participation in school decision-making. This

53

scale has four sub-sections: job satisfaction [items 29 and 30], professional development [items 31, 32, 33, and 34], job commitment [items 35 and 36], and innovativeness [items 37, 38, and 39]. These sub-sections contain five-point Likert-type items. These items are rated as "yes" or "no".

However, the additional dimensions such as job involvement, teachers' desire to participate, and administrative principles have seven items. Job involvement has two Likert-type items [43, 44, and 45]. However, the items on teachers' desire to participate are rated as "yes" or "no" while those of job involvement and administrative principles are rated as "strongly agree", "agree", "uncertain", "disagree", and "strongly disagree".

The fifth section deals with teachers' demographic characteristics and has six response items of which dimensions and responses are as follows: Item 47 sex; male and female, item 48 age; 29 yrs or less, 30 – 39 yrs, 40 – 49 yrs, 50 yrs or more, item 49 years taught as a teacher ; 5 years or less, 6-12 yrs, 13 – 19 yrs, 20 yrs or more, item 50 duration taught in present school ; 5 months or less, 6-12 months, 13-19 months, 20 months or more, item 52 highest academic qualification; below first degree, first degree, second degree, and PhD, and item 52 teacher professionalism ;yes or no.

Pilot Testing

A pilot-testing of the instrument was conducted in one of the senior secondary schools [Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School] where I was a tutor. This study was carried out during the third term break. However, I first went to the school head and asked for permission to administer the questionnaires to

the teachers. With the consent of the school head, I was guided by the assistant school head to draw a sampling frame.

This sampling frame was drawn from the 2009/2010 Ghana Education Service teacher population census of the school. In all, 30 professional teachers, who had served in their schools for a period not less than six months, were randomly drawn from the sampling frame to constitute the sample of study.

The purpose of this pre-testing was to test the instrument I designed to ascertain its accuracy, consistency and appropriateness and to make modifications where necessary based on the experience gained during the course of the pilot-testing. Also, it was intended to find out whether instructions of the questionnaire were clear and precise in helping the respondents to complete the questionnaire. It enabled me to test the data analysis techniques proposed in the research proposal to ascertain their suitability.

I personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents at their places of residence on September 8th and followed up on the 14th, and the 15th day of the same month 2010 for the answered questionnaires. Therefore, all the thirty questionnaires distributed were collected in three days. A response rate of 100% was achieved.

The data collected by the questionnaires were edited for accuracy and consistency of responses and for finding out whether all questions were properly answered. The edited questionnaire were coded for SPSS [11.5] tabulation and analysis for internal consistency of scale items of the

questionnaires. This led to the reduction of the total items of the teachers' questionnaire from 83 items to 52 items.

Also, some of the instructions accompanying sections of the questionnaire were modified for the purpose of clarity and precision. Apart from these, the data analysis technique for item 41 and item 43 was changed from chi-square analysis to Pearson correlation coefficient analysis because the data revealed that two of the cells of the cross-table had expected value less than five responses. Jones (1990) explained that, in a situation where a cross-table has two or more cells, the chi-square should not be used if one or more of the cells have expected frequencies less than five because it may lead me to draw an erroneous conclusion.

Three methods were used to validate the questionnaires. Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument is purported to be measuring what it is constructed for (Babbie, 1983). To ensure the questionnaires had the desired validity, they were constructed to have face, content, and concurrent validities. I first reviewed the literature to ascertain how similar variables were operationally defined, their indicators, the format of their instruments, and the construct they were purported to measure. This guided me to operationally define the variables under study and designed questionnaires to measure them. Copies of the designed questionnaires were given to some teachers to first of all ascertain their face validity.

The face validity of the items of a questionnaire refers to the degree to which the items appear to be a measure of the variable of concern (Babbie, 1983). Some of the revised items in the teachers' questionnaire were item

numbers 7, 14, 23, 24, and 35 and those in the school heads' questionnaire were item number 6 and 11. Copies of the revised questionnaires were again given to the same teachers and experts in educational research to ascertain their content and construct validities. The Content validity of a questionnaire refers to the adequacy of the items as true indicators and true measure of a variable and the appropriateness of the items' format in a questionnaire. On the other hand construct validity refers to the degree to which the totality of evidence obtained by an instrument is consistent with theoretical expectations (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). The questionnaires were further revised based on the feed back.

However, the teachers' questionnaire was further administered to a randomly selected sample of 30 professional teachers from Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School where I teach. The data gathered were subjected to factor analysis to ascertain the items, which are true indicators of each variable in the questionnaire. The selected items, after factor analysis, were further subjected to scatter plot to determine the unidimensionality of the items (indicators) of each variable. This was done to ensure that the items of each variable were its true indicators.

Scatter plot is a way of plotting the data of two or more variable in a graph form with one variable plotted on the X-axis and the other on the Y-axis so as to determine the relationship between the variables (Oskshott, 1994). In line with this Babbie (1983) noted that, "a given item that is not related to several items probably should be dropped from consideration. At the same time, if two items are perfectly related to one another, then only one is

necessary for inclusion" (p.371) because both items could obtain the same answers or scores.

After validating the questionnaires, their reliabilities were computed using Statistical Package for Social Science [SPSS] for Alpha reliability test of scale items of the questionnaire. The teachers' questionnaires were personally given out to 30 professional teachers randomly selected from Kadjebi-Asato Senior High School on a pilot-testing. The overall Alpha reliability [internal consistency] for teacher involvement and participation scale was 0.8093 while its sub-scales had the following: curriculum and instruction [0.8077], students' [0.8616], staffing [0.9386], operation [0.8996], school-community [0.8005], and financial matters [0.8727]. The teacher involvement and participation scale [tips] of Russell, Copper, and Greenblatt (1992) reported an overall Cronbach Alpha reliability of 0.96 and its sub-scales had the following internal reliability: curriculum and instruction [0.86], staffing [0.87], and operations [0.89].

On ways of involving teachers in school decision-making, school meeting scale had an internal reliability of [0.7815]. The overall Cronbach Alpha reliability [internal consistency] for factor influencing teacher participation in school decision-making scale was [0.7638] while its sub-scales had the following: Job satisfaction [0.7000], professional development [0.7289], job commitment [0.7391], and innovativeness [0.8575].

These reliability coefficients showed the extent to which a measuring instrument was likely to produce consistent scores or answers. The closer the index was to one the greater the likelihood of the instrument producing

consistent scores or answers. However, the closer the index was to zero, the lower the likelihood of obtaining consistent scores or answers. Therefore, a good instrument was one of which the reliability coefficient index is closer to one (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000).

Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure of the pilot-testing of the instrument was adopted with little modification for the main study. The data collection of the main study began when I first went to each school head on Monday, September 27th, 2010 and asked for permission to use their respective schools as units of analysis. This time was deemed appropriate because the school heads had to settle down with the day's business first before they could receive visitors. With the consent of the school heads, I was guided by the assistant headmasters to draw lists of professional teachers serving in their respective schools for a period not less than six months.   I personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents with the aid of the assistant headmasters of each school on Tuesday, September 28th and Wednesday, 29th September 2010 during break periods.

The respondents sealed each completed questionnaire in an envelope provided and returned it to the assistant headmaster of each school. The questionnaires were then collected from the assistant headmaster on the 11th, 12th and 13th day of October 2010. As a result, out of the 99 teachers who received the questionnaires in the three senior secondary schools, 87 returned their questionnaires. This represented a response rate of 87.9%. Babbie

(1983) noted that the response rate of 70% or more was very good for a descriptive study.

Data Analysis

The data gathered from the questionnaires were categorical and ordinal. Oakshott (1994) explained that categorical data are data, which can only be placed into a suitable category. However, ordinal data are data that are given numerical value to indicate the degree of the variable present. Example is an assessment score from one to ten. The data were first edited to determine their accuracy, consistency, and appropriateness. The data were again coded for tabulation on a computer by SPSS [11.5] to ascertain the number of individuals scoring in each category of a variable as a frequency or percentage or both. Also, some of the data were summarized and presented as mode, mean, and correlation coefficient. Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) noted that mode, mean and correlation coefficient were the most appropriate measure of location and correlation for descriptive studies.

On what is the level of teacher participation in school decision-making? The responses of the items [1, 2, 3, and 4] were coded as [1] very often, [2] often, [3] least often, and [4] never. The coded data were tallied on a computer program such as SPSS and presented as a frequency and percentage table. The item scoring the highest frequency on a given response in the ranking was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the position of the statement in the ranking. This statistical procedure enabled the researcher to ascertain a fair opinion of the respondents on the level of teachers' participation in school decision-making.

In what school decision-making areas are teachers deeply involved? The responses to various items of the teacher involvement and participation in school decision-making sub-scales: curriculum and instruction [items 6 and 7], students matters [items 8 and 9], staffing [items 10 and 11], operations/physical facilities [items 12 and 13], and school-community relationship [items 14, 15, and 16] were coded as [4] always, [3] frequently, [2] occasionally, and [1] never.

The number of individuals' scoring the various responses of each item within a dimension was tallied using SPSS and presented as frequencies and also converted into percentages in a table form. The item with the highest frequency on a given response was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the settlement in question. This choice of statistical procedure gave the researcher the chance of determining the degree of teacher involvement in each of the dimensions. However, the responses of the items on financial matters [items 7 and 18] were coded as yes [2] no [1], tallied and presented as frequencies, and percentages in a table form. The item with the highest frequency on a given response was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the position of the item.

What are the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making? To answer this question, the responses of each item measuring delegation were coded as yes [2] no [1]. The number of individuals' scoring the various response of each item was tallied and presented as a frequency table. The item with the highest frequency on a given response was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the position of the item. The statistical method

enabled me to ascertain the general opinion of the respondents on the practice of delegation in their respective schools.

On the issue of school meeting, the responses to the items of the scale were tallied and presented as a frequency table. The item with the highest frequency on a response was considered as the majority opinion on the respondents on the item. On the area of school Board of Governors, the item [25] asked for the respondents' views on the existence of a Board of Governors in their respective schools. The responses to this item were coded as yes [2] and no [1].

However, the responses for items [26] were regrouped into two categories and coded as follows: The response [one] indicated that the respondents have adequate knowledge of the number of teacher representation in their school Boards. This category was coded as [2] while the responses [none, two and three or more] were merged into a single category indicating that the respondents do not have knowledge of the number of teacher representation in their school Board of Governors. This response was coded as [1].

This was done for the purpose of analysis. The number of individuals' scoring the various responses of each item was tallied and presented as frequencies and percentages. The item with the highest frequency on a given response was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the item.

On school committee system, item [27] solicited the respondents' view on the number of committees existing in their school. The responses to the

item were merged into three responses and coded as follows: [1] no committee, [2] two committee, [3] three or more committees. This was done for the purpose of analysis. Also, item [28] sought the respondents' views on teacher representation in school committees. The responses to the item were merged into three responses and coded as follows: [1] No teacher representation in school committee, [2] teacher representation in one school committee, [3] teacher representation in two school committees, [3] teacher representation in three or more school committees. The number of individuals' scoring the various responses of each item was tallied and presented as frequencies and percentages.

The item with the highest frequency on a given response was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the item. These statistical procedures aided me to ascertain the respondents' view on their involvement in school decision-making through delegation, school meetings, school Board of Governors, and school committees.

On demographic characteristics of teachers associated with their participation in school decision-making? The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r) of the association between the demographic characteristics of teachers and school decision-making areas were computed at a significant level of 0.05. A significant value, which was more than 0.05, signified non-existent of linear relationship between variables.

However, a significant value, which was less than 0.05, indicated the existence of a linear relationship between the variables. Also, a correlation co-efficient of zero (0.0) indicated no association, a correlation co-efficient

between + 0.10 and + 0.30 indicated weak positive association, + 0.40 and + 0.60 represented moderate positive association, - 0.40 and – 0.60 represented moderate negative association, and -0.70 and -1.0 showed strong negative association.

What factors are accountable for teacher participation in school decision-making? To answer this question, the responses of the items of the factor influencing teacher participation in school decision-making sub-sections, job satisfaction [items 29 and 30] professional development, [items 31, 32, 33, and 34], job commitment [item 35 and 36] innovativeness [items 37, 38 and 39] job involvement [items 40, and 41], and administrative principle [items 44, 45, and 46] were coded as [5] "strongly agree", [4] "agree", [3] "uncertain", [2] "disagree", and [1] "strongly disagree". The individuals' scores to the various response of each item under a dimension were tallied and summarized into mean and ranked. This statistical method enabled the researcher to ascertain the six topmost factors, which influence teachers' participation in school decision-making.

In addition, the responses of the items on job involvement [item 42] and the teacher's desire to participate in school decision-making [item 43] were coded as [2] yes and [1] no. The individuals' scores to the various responses were tallied and presented as a 2X2 cross-table. However, Pearson correlation of the two dimensions was computed to ascertain whether teachers' desire was associated with teacher involvement in school decision-making. Pearson correlation analysis was used instead of chi-square because two of the cells of the 2X2 cross-table had expected frequencies less than five.

Also, the response of the items on teachers' demographic characteristics were tallied, analyzed and presented as frequencies and percentages. On the other hand, the response to the eleventh items of the school heads' questionnaire were coded, analyzed, and presented as frequencies. The items with the highest frequency on the response [strongly agree or very important] were considered as the factors which influenced the level of teacher involvement in school decision-making. The responses to the demographic characteristics of the school head were tallied analyzed and presented as frequencies.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter contains the results of data analysis on the background characteristics of respondents and research questions and the discussions of the results. These results and discussions are based on specific objectives of the study to identify school decision areas of teacher participation, ways of involving teachers in school decision making, teachers' demographic characteristics that are associated with participation in school decision-making and factors which influence teacher participation in school decision-making.

Discussion of Results

Background Characteristics of Respondents [Teachers]

This unit of the chapter tried to find out the age, academic qualification, teaching experience, the duration of service of respondents in their present schools and their professional status.

The data gathered and analyzed revealed that, out of the 87 respondents, 84 were professional teachers and out of this number, 64 (76.2%) constituted males while 20 (23.8%) represented females. Also, a look at table 2, shows that as at the beginning of 2009/2010 school session, 60.7% of these professional teachers aged between 30-39 years, 23.8% aged between 40-49 years while 8.3% aged 29 years or less. However, the older group, aged 50 years or more, only constituted 7.2%.

Table 2

Age of Professional Teachers

Age (Years)	No. of Teachers	Percentage (%)
Less than 29	7	8.3
30 – 39	51	60.7
40 – 40	20	23.8
50 or more	6	7.2
Total	84	100.0

Source: Author's field note, September 2010.

Table 3

Qualification of Teachers

Qualification	No. of Teachers	Percentage (%)
Below First Degree	15	17.3
First Degree	72	82.7
Second Degree	0	0
PhD	0	0
Total	87	100.0

Source: Author's field note, September 2010.

Table 4

Teaching Experience in Present School

Years of Teaching (Years)	No. of Teachers	Percentage (%)
5 and Below	9	10.7
6 – 12	40	45.2
13 – 19	38	44.1
20 or More	0	0
Total	87	100.0

Source: Author's field note, September 2010.

In addition, table 3 shows that, 82.7% of the total respondents were first degree holders. Out of this number, 74.3% were males and 25.7% were females. The remaining 17.3% of the respondents held academic qualifications below first degree. Moreover, from table 4, 45.2% of the total respondents had 6-12 years of teaching experience while 44.1 % had between 13-19 years of teaching experience. However, only 10.7% taught for less than six years. Apart from these, 58.1% of the respondents were in their respective schools for periods not less than 20 months while 44.1% were in their present schools for periods less than 20 months.

However, the remaining three respondents were school heads who consisted of two males and a female. The males aged 50 years or more and had been school heads for periods not less than 12 years. However, their female counterpart aged between 40-49 years and had been heading schools for a period not less than 6 years. Among the school heads, one male had a

first degree and the others had Master's degrees. In addition, each of them held current post for a period not less than 20 months as at 2009/2010.

Research question 1:

What is the level of teachers' participation in school decision-making?

To answer this research question, the respondents were asked to rank five items, which depicted the various levels of teacher participation in school decision-making as stated by Tannenbaum and Schmidt's (1958) continuum of leadership styles. The rankings were computed, summarized and presented as shown in Table 5.

a. The codes used and their meanings:

b. N = number of respondents

c. % = percentage of total respondents

Item 1 = The school head makes a decision alone and announces it to the teachers.

Item 2 = The school head makes a decision and sells it to the teacher to solicit their support.

Item 3 = The school head presents the problem to the teachers and solicits their suggestions before he/she makes the final decision.

Item 4 = The school head presents the problem to the teachers and jointly takes the decision with them.

Item 5 = The school head presents the problem to the teachers, defines the limit of authority and leaves them alone to take the needed decisions within the defined limit of authority

.

Table 5

The Level of Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making

	Ranking by Position				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Total
Item	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
1	10(11.9)	17(20.2)	9(10.7)	48(57.1)	84(100)
2	14(16.7)	28(33.3)	15(17.9)	27(23.1)	84(100)
3	31(36.9)	25(29.8)	14(16.7)	14(16.7)	84(100)
4	24(28.6)	31(36.9)	14(16.7)	15(17.9)	84(100)
5	4(4.8)	20(13.9)	14(16.7)	46(54.8)	84(100)

Source: Author's field Note, September 2010

From Table 5, 36.9% of the total respondents ranked the item, "the school head presents the problem to the teachers and solicits their suggestions before he/she makes the final decision (item 3)", as first. That is, the very often decision-making practices of their schools' heads. The item, "the school head presents the problem to the teachers and jointly takes the decision with them (item 4)" was also ranked second by 36.9% of the total respondents. The

70

item "the school head makes a decision and sells it to the teachers to solicit their support (item 2)" was ranked third by17.9% of the total respondents respectively.   Also, the item "the school head makes a decision alone and announces it to the teachers (item 1)" was ranked fourth by 57.1% of the total respondents.   The school heads noted that these levels of teachers' participation are based on factors such as:

a. The teachers' personal interest at stake,

b. Teachers' expertise in solving the problem

c. The quality of the decision needed

d. The information available to the teachers to make a quality decision

e. The degree of commitment of the teachers to the decision

f. The sufficiency of information the teachers have in making decision.

Research question 2

What school decision-making areas are teachers involved?

a. To answer this question, data were gathered from field investigation, analyzed, and presented as shown in tables 6 and 7.

b. The codes used and their meanings:

Item 6 = I decide the teaching and learning support materials for my lessons.

Item 7 = I plan my lesson alone.

Item 8 = I participate in formulating guidelines for students' admission into my school.

Item 9 = I participate in the placement of students into programs of study in my school.

Item 10 = I participate in the formulation of guidelines for the recruitment of teachers into my school.

Item 11 = I recommend my fellow teachers for promotion.

Item 12 = I participate in the formulation of safety guidelines for the use of my school facilities.

Item 13 = I take part in deciding the use of my school facilities.

Item 14 = I participate in the formulation of guidelines involving my school participation in community programmes.

Item 15 = I take part in activities of the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) in my school.

Item 16 = I actively participate in planning my school clean-up exercises in the community.

Item 17 = I take part in deciding how much my department spends each year.

Items 18 = Do you know the amount of money voted for your department each academic year?

From Table 6, majority of the respondents were always involved in curriculum and instructional activities by planning their lessons alone and deciding the teaching and learning support materials to be used for such lessons. As a result, only 2 (2.4%) of the total respondents planned their lessons with others. Apart from this, 1 (1.2%) of the total respondents did

have others deciding with them as to what teaching and learning support materials to be used for their lessons.

Table 6

Areas in which Teachers Participate in School Decision-Making

	Responses				
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Total
Item	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Curriculum and instruction					
6	46(54.8)	19(22.6)	18(21.4)	1(1.2)	84(100)
7	60(71.4)	14(16.7)	8(9.0)	2(2.4)	84(100)
Students' matters					
8	4(4.8)	2(2.4)	28(33.3)	50(59.5)	84(100)
9	2(2.4)	3(3.6)	15(17.9)	64(76.2)	84(100)
Staffing					
10	1(1.2)	4(4.8)	79(94.1)	0(00.0)	84(100)
11	1(1.2)	3(3.6)	7(8.3)	73(86.9)	84(100)
Operation					
12	4(4.8)	6(7.1)	59(70.2)	15(17.9)	84(100)

Table 6 cont'd

13	3(3.6)	3(3.6)	60(71.5)	18(21.4)	84(100)

School-community relationship

14	1(1.2)	2(2.4)	47(55.9)	34(40.5)	84(100)
15	15(17.9)	14(16.7)	36(42.9)	19(22.6)	84(100)
16	6(7.1	9(10.7)	46(54..3)	23(27.4)	84(100)

Source: Author's field Note, September, 2010

In addition, majority of the respondents were occasionally involvement in school operations by deciding the use of school facilities and formulating safety guidelines for them. Therefore, only 18 (21.4%) and 15 (17.9%) of the total respondents never either took part in deciding the use of such facilities or participating in formulating safety guidelines for their use respectively.

Table 7

Involvement of Teachers in Financial Decision-Making

	Responses		
	Involved	Not involved	Total
Item	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Financial matters			
17	25(29.8)	59(70.2)	84(100)
18	5(6.0)	79(94.0)	84(100)

Source: Author's field Note, September, 2010

Although majority of the respondents were occasionally engaged in planning school clean-up exercises in the community, taking part in activities of the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) of their schools and formulating guidelines school-community relationship, only 23 (27.4%), 19 (22.6%) and 34 (40-5%) of the total respondents were never involved in any of the activities respectively.

On the issue of students' admission and placement, staffing, and financial matters, a cursory look at Tables 6 and 7 revealed that majority of the respondents were never involved in decision-making concerning such dimensions. As a result, 50 (59.5%) to 79 (94.0%) of the total respondents never took part in making any decisions relating to them.

Research question 3:

What are the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making?

From investigation, the date gathered and analyzed was presented as shown in Tables 8 and 9.

c. The codes used and their meanings:

Item 19 = Activities in my school slow down when my school head is away.

Item 20 = My school head takes a long time to get a simple job done.

Item 21= My school head does follow-up to find out how far I have performed an assigned job.

Item 22 = I put forward issues for discussion during staff meetings in my school.

Item 23 = I submit issues as agenda items for discussion at staff meetings.

Item 24 = I take part in discussions at staff meetings

Table 8

Teachers' Participation in School Decision-Making Through Delegation

	Responses		
	Not involved	Involved	Total
Item	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Delegation			
19	29(34.5)	55(65.5)	84(100)
20	35(41.7)	49(58.3)	84(100)
21	20(23.8)	64(76.2)	84(100)

Source: Author's field Note, September, 2010

From Table 8, majority of the respondents agreed that some form of delegation did exist in their schools. As a result, 55 (65.5%) of the total respondents said that activities in their schools never slowed down when their school heads were away. Also, 49 (58.3%) of the total respondents held the view that their school heads did not take a long time to get a simple job done.

Moreover, 64 (76.2%) of the total respondents settled that their school heads do follow-up to find out how far they have performed assigned jobs.

Table 9

Teachers' Participation in School Decision-Making through School Meetings

	Frequency of involvement				
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Total
Item	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
22	19(22.6)	12(14.3)	41(48.8)	12(14.3)	84(100)
23	4(4.8)	3(3.6)	34(40.5)	43(51.1)	84(100)
24	27(32.1)	28(33.3)	29(34.5)	0(00.0)	84(100)

Source: Author's field Note, September, 2010

A look at Table 9 shows that a majority of the respondents occasionally tabled proposals and frequently took part in discussions at staff meetings. However, 43 (51.1%) of the total respondents never submitted any issues as agenda items for staff meeting while only 41 (49.9%) of the total respondents did.

Table 10: Number of School Committees in your School

Number of committees	Number of teachers admitting availability of committees in school
3 or more	61 (72.6%)
2	13 (15.5%)
1	7 (8.3%)

77

Table 10 cont'd.

None	3 (3.6%)
Total	84 (100%)

Source: Author's field Note, September, 2010

On the issue of teacher involvement in school decision-making via school Board activities, all 84 respondents agreed that their respective schools had Boards of Governors with teacher representation. However, only 33 (39.3%) of the total respondents did not know that they were represented at school Board meetings by a teacher.

Table 11: Membership of School Committees

Number of school committees	Number of teachers belonging to committees
3 or more	6 (7.0%)
2	11 (13.0%)
1	20 (23.0%)
None	47 (57.0)
Total	84 (100%)

Source: Author's field Note, September, 2010

On the area of school committees, Table 10 shows that 84 respondents were asked to identify the number of committees existing in their schools, 61 (72.6%) identified three or more committees that exist in their schools while 13 (15.5%) identified two, 7 (8.3%) identified one committee and 3 (3.6%) identified none. Also, out of the 84 respondents, Table 11 shows that 47 (57.0%) were not members of any committee while 6 (7.0%) were members of three or more committees, 11 (13.0%) belonging to two committees and 20 (23.0%) were members of one committee.

Research question 4: What demographic characteristics of teachers are associated with their participation in school decision-making?

To answer this question, the data collected from the respondents' demographic characteristics (gender, age, academic qualification, teaching experience, years of service in present school, and teacher professionalism) were correlated with those of their participation in school decision-making areas and presented as shown in Table 12.

a. The codes used and their meanings:

Item 47 = sex of respondents

Item 48 = Age of respondents

Item 49 = Teaching experience of respondents

Item 50 = Duration of service of respondents in their present schools

Item 51 = Academic qualification of respondents

Item 52 = Professionalism of respondents

Item 6 = I decide the teaching and learning support materials for my lessons.

Item 7 = I plan my lesson alone.

Item 8 = I participate in formulating guidelines for students' admission into my school.

Item 9 = I participate in the placement of students into programs of study in my school.

Item 10 = I participate in the formulation of guidelines for the recruitment of teachers into my school.

Item 11 = I recommend my fellow teachers for promotion.

Item 12 = I participate in the formulation of safety guidelines for the use of my school facilities.

Item 13 = I take part in deciding the use of my school facilities.

Item 14 = I participate in the formulation of guidelines involving my school participation in community programmes.

Item 15 = I take part in activities of the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) in my school.

Item 16 = I actively participate in planning my school clean-up exercises in the community.

Item 17 = I take part in deciding how much my department spends each year.

Items 18 = Do you know the amount of money voted for your department each academic year?

Table 12

**Correlation and Significance Level (in brackets) of Teachers'
Demographic Characteristics and their Participation in School Decision-
Making Areas**

School Decision   Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Making Areas "Item 47" " 48   " 49   " 50   " 51   " 52

Curriculum and instruction

Item 6	-0.022	-0.130	-0.143	0.016	0.106	-0.135
	(0.843)	(0.238)	(0.195)	(0.884)	(0.339)	(0.220)
Item 7	0.166	-0.091	-0.031	0.107	-0.013	-0.101
	(0.132)	(0.410)	(0.781)	(0.333)	(0.910)	(0.363)

Students' matters

Item 8	-0.167	0.241*	0.239*	0.022	-0.085	-0.109
	(0.129)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.842)	(0.441)	(0.323)
Item 9	-0.112	0.175	0.152	0.113	-0.064	-0.079
	(0.308)	(0.112)	(0.167)	(0.306)	(0.561)	(0.478)

Table 12 Cont'd.

Item 10	0.009	0.211	0.252*	0.011	0.038	-0.053
	(0.932)	(0.054)	(0.021)	(0.920)	(0.734)	0.635
Item 11	0.037	0.082	-0.018	-0.156	0.021	0.052
	(0.738)	(0.457)	(0.869)	(0.157)	(0.848)	(0.640)
Operation						
Item 12	-0.081	0.070	0001	0.100	-0.105	-0.007
	(0.463)	(0.526)	(0.991)	(0.367)	(0.343)	(0.947)
Item 13	-0.114	0126	0.070	-073	-0.09	0.000
	(0.302	(0.252)	(0.527)	(0.510)	(0.377)	(1.000)
School-community relationship						
Item 14	-0.065	0.097	0.050	0.074	0.038	-0.082
	(0.560)	(0.379)	(0.652)	(0.506)	(0.729)	(0.456)
Item 15	-0.067	0.118	0.096	0..263*	-0.020	-0.059
	(0.547)	(0.285)	(0.383)	(0.016)	(0.860)	(0.0595)
Item 16	0.051	0.014	0.053	0.059	0.084	0.075
	(0.645)	(0.902)	(0.632)	(0.596)	(0.445)	(0.510)

Table 12 Cont'd.

Financial matters

Item 17	0.119	-0.197	-0.148	0.076	0.221*	0.069
	(0.280)	(0.0730)	(0.181)	(0.491)	(0.043)	(0.532)
Item 18	-0.141	-0.034	0.022	0.124	0.113	-0.039
	(0.202)	(0.758)	(0.842)	(0.259)	(0.308)	(0.723)

Source: Derived from Table 6 and data on demographic characteristics of respondents

** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*= Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

$P < 0.05$ with one degree freedom

$P < 0.001$ with one degree freedom

From Table 12, the respondents' demographic variables, age and years of teaching experience, showed positive correlations ($r = 0.241$ and $r = 0.239$ respectively) with their involvement in students' matter such as formulating guidelines for students' admission into schools at a significant level of 0.05 with one degree freedom. This correlation is low. Teachers did not participate in decision-making on guidelines for students' admission into schools.

Apart from this, the years of teaching experience of the respondents, further, indicated a position correlation ($r = 0.252$) with the respondents' participating in staffing activity such as formulating guidelines for the recruitment of teachers into their schools at a significant level of 0.05 with

one-degree freedom. Moreover, the respondents' duration of service in their participation in activities of Parent Teacher Association (PTA) in their schools at a significant level of 0.05 with one degree of freedom. In addition, the academic qualification of the respondents showed a positive correlation (r = 0.221) with their participation in school financial issue such as deciding how much their departments' spends each year at a significant level of 0.05 with one degree freedom.

However, these positive correlations were statistically significant because the significant values of the correlations were less than 0.05 with one degree of freedom. However, the absolute values of the correlations were closer to zero. As a result, their relationships were not strong enough to be practically significant.

Research questions 5:

What factors influence teachers' participation in school decision-making?

To identify these factors, the following dimensions were investigated, job satisfaction, professional development, job commitment, job involvement, innovativeness, teacher's desire to participate, and administrative principles. The data gathered from the respondents were analyzed and presented as shown in Tables 13.

a. The codes used and their meanings:

Item 29 = I feel as being part of the school when I participate in school decision-making

Item 30 = I feel as being recognized when I take part in school decision-making.

Item 31 = I acquire new knowledge from my participation in school decision-making

Item 32 = My skills in decision-making are enhanced due to my involvement in school decision-making.

Item 33 = I can now take some decisions without relying much on my superiors.

Item 34 = I can now take on a little high responsibility with confidence.

Item 35 = I prefer working a little more on my job to attain results.

Items 36 = I always work to meet job standards.

Item 37 = I use new teaching methods.

Item 39 = I easily acquaint myself with the use of new equipment.

Item 40 = I see the school as my own.

Item 41 = I see my job as a central part of my life.

Item 42 = Are you involved in school decision-making?

Item 43 = Do you desire to be involved?

Item 44 = I take part in school decision-making when my interest is at stake.

Item 45 = I Participate in school decision-making when I have the expertise to contribute meaningfully.

Item 46 = I take part in school decision-making when I have the authority to do so.

Table 13

Factors which Influence Teachers' Participation in School Decision-Making

Item	Mean	Ranking
Job satisfaction		
29	4.52	1st
30	4.14	8th
Professional development		
31	4.33	3rd
32	4.18	7th
33	3.75	11th
34	4.13	9th
Job commitment		
35	4.14	8th
36	4.35	2nd
Innovativeness		
37	4.27	5th
38	4.19	6th
39	4.02	10th
Job involvement		
40	3.42	13th
41	4.30	4th

Table 13 Cont'd.

Administrative

44	2.38	15th
45	3.32	14th
46	3.44	12th

Source: Author's field Note, October, 2010

From Table 13, the six topmost factors, in order of descending identified by the respondents that influenced their participation in school decision-making most were: (1) The need for belongingness [item 29], (2) The need to work to meet job standards [item 36], (3) The need for acquiring knowledge [item 31], (4) The acceptance of one's job as a central part of one's life [item 41], (5) The need to use new teaching methods [item 37], (6) The need to acquaint oneself with the use of new equipment [item 38]. The rest of the factors were considered by the respondents as less influencing.

Discussion of Results

The analysis of data gathered on the form of teachers' involvement in school decision-making with school heads revealed that the teachers were most often in consultative decision-making with their school heads. This goes to affirm Tannenhbaum and Schmidt's (1958) assertion that, in administrative practice, the leadership styles and their accompanying employees' (teachers') participation in decision-making is somewhere between school heads announcing a decision to teachers and teachers taking full control of decision making. This finding implies the likelihood of greater teacher participation in

87

school decision making. Gregory and Ricky (1998) pointed out that employees' (teachers') participation in school decision making brought about increased teacher satisfaction, reduced group conflict and satisfied high order needs such as self-esteem and self actualization.

This, in totality, increases teachers' productivity. Lucey (1994) corroborated this when Lucey pointed out that there is some evidence that participative styles are associated with higher-producing groups. The possible reason for this level of teacher involvement in school decision making is the factors, which the school heads, took into consideration when they were involving their teachers in decision making. The prominent ones identified by this study were the teachers' interest at stake, teachers' expertise in solving the problem, the quality of the decision needed, the information available to the teachers to make quality decision, the degree of commitment of the teachers to the decision and the sufficiency of information the teachers have in making a quality decision. Also, another, possible explanation for this result is that some school heads are unsecured and fearful of diminishing their power when they allow greater participation of teachers in school decision making. As a result, all that they can do is to adapt pseudo-participation by consulting their teachers for ideas in order to take a decision. However, in reality, such ideas do not sometimes influence their final decision. Also, the study into school decision making areas in which teachers participate revealed the following.

1. The study found that teachers always participated in curriculum and instructional decisions by planning their lessons alone and deciding the teaching and learning support materials to be used for such lessons. This finding agrees with Kuku and Taylor (2002), whose comparative

study found that faculty teachers (departmental teachers) participate frequently in decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. This finding could mean that teachers have high preference for taking decision on curriculum and instructional activities. Therefore, school heads should enhance this to promote the success of the implementation of the school curriculum because, according to Reid, Hopkins and Holly (1990), the success of a curriculum implementation depends on the understanding and commitment that the teachers have towards the curriculum. This finding may, also, be as a result of the teacher's roles in curriculum implementation. A nation with a cultural diversity (such as Ghana) places its teachers in a position that compels them to interpret and implement the content of the curriculum to meet the needs of the students, community, and the nation as a whole (CWS, 1993).

2. The study found out that teachers occasionally made decisions on school operation by deciding the use of school facilities and formulating safety guidelines for their use. This result agreed with the finding of Kuku and Taylor (2002), who found that faculty teachers (departmental teachers) occasionally participate in making decisions involving school operations (management of school buildings). It has corresponding relevance for maintaining school physical facilities. Reid, Hopkins and Holly (1990) noted that a good school is one, which maintains an orderly and safe environment for students and teachers. Sergiovanni and Starrant (1998) pointed out that such school environment improves students' performance. Hence, there is the need

to promote greater teacher participation in the management of school operation/facilities.

3. The study revealed that teachers occasionally made decisions on school-community relationship by planning school clean-up exercises in the community, taking part in activities of the Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs') of their schools and formulating guidelines for their schools' participation in community programmes. This result confirms Adesina's, (1990) view that teachers must have adequate knowledge of the communities in which their respective schools are situated in order to be in a better position to make a wide variety of satisfactory decisions in adapting the content of the national curriculum to meet the needs and abilities of the students and the communities as a whole. Therefore, the teachers must be involved in community activities in order to understand the community better. Also, under PNDC Law 207, both boarding and day senior secondary schools are community-based and under this concept, communities are to assist the schools set and achieve their performance target (Mankoe, 2002). Therefore, the school heads and their teachers must build strong relationship with these communities in order to win their support (Farrant, 1980). To do this, Mankoe, (2002), noted that teachers must actively participate in community activities such as clean-up campaign, health education, and festivals. Farrant (1980), further noted that this way, schools could win the support of the communities and play their role as sub-units of the communities in training the youth.

4. The study indicated that teachers never made decisions on student matters such as formulating guidelines for students' admission into their school and the placement of students into programmes of study. This result agrees with Kuku and Taylor (2002). Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that faculty teachers (departmental teachers) hardly ever participate in decision making involving student matters. Perhaps a reason for this situation can be found in Mankoe's (2002) observation that teachers' view participation as additional administrative responsibility to their teaching workload or they lack the professional competence to participate. One could further argue that this is as a result of administrative practices and work culture. The placement of students into programmes of study in senior secondary schools in Ghana is most often done by the school heads and their assistants. In some situations, this may be assigned to a placement and orientation committee. However, the inception of the computerized schools' selection and placement system (CSSPS) in September, 2005, has replaced the manual system of selection and placement of students into schools and programme of study. This has completely disengaged senior secondary teachers from such activity (Ghana Education Service, 2003).

5. The study found that teachers did not take decisions involving staffing such as the formulation of guidelines for the recruitment of teachers into their schools and the recommendation of their fellow teachers for promotion. This result may be a reflection of the current administration practices. Under the present system of education,

senior secondary heads have very limited power in the recruitment, appointment, promotion and disciplining of teachers. School heads can only recruit teachers for their respective schools based on approval from the Metropolitan, Municipal or District Director of Education. However, the Director-General of Education, the Metropolitan, Municipal and District Director of Education are responsible for the recruitment and appointment of teachers based on recommendation from the school heads (Ghana Education Service Council, 2000). Therefore, teachers could not have the chance of participating in such decision making. It is against such background that the President's Committee on Review of Education Reforms in Ghana recommended that senior secondary school heads should be involved in the selection of teachers for their respective schools (Government of Ghana, 2002). Adesina (1990) observed that such involvement will enable school heads to select teachers who can contribute meaningfully to the success of their schools.

6. The study further found that teachers did not either know the amount of money voted for their department each academic year or take part in deciding how much their departments spend each year. This confirms Sabo, Barnes, and Hoy's (1996), assertion that budgeting of teachers are decision making areas where teachers are highly deprived. On the contrary, Kuku and Taylor (2002) found that teachers sometimes make decision on budgeting. One possible reason for this result can be found in the observation of the President's committee on the review, of the education reforms in Ghana. The committee observed that due to

lack of transparency in the financial management of schools, school heads do not involve their teachers in school financial matters. Consequently, there is a great deal of disaffection among staff (Government of Ghana, 2002). It is along this line that Duodu (2001) advised that school heads must ensure that all section and departments are consulted and their needs incorporated in the school budget. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), explained that this is necessary to avert the uncertainty that marks budget estimates. Asiedu-Akrofi further cautioned that school heads and bursars should not monopolize preparation of school budget estimates because the teachers who use the equipments and other supplies in the classrooms, laboratories and workshops are in a better position to advise them. Moreover, the investigation into the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making found the following:

1. The study revealed that teachers were involved in school decision making through delegation. As a result, activities in their schools did not slow down or come to a halt in the absence of their school heads. Also, the school heads followed up to find out how far teachers had performed tasks assigned to them. Apart from these, the school heads did not take a long time to get a simple job done. This finding agrees with the Ghana Education Service's (2001), assertion that schools which practice delegation are those whose heads do not feel pressed for time to neither perform their daily activities nor take a long time to get a simple job done. In addition, activities in such schools do not slow down or come to a halt in the absence of the school heads.

Moreover, the teachers do not always wait for the school heads' instructions before they can perform their duties.

2. The study indicated that teachers frequently participated in school meetings by involving in discussions, occasionally tabling proposals and seldom submitted issues as agenda items for staff meeting. This finding may be as a result of the nature in which the meetings were planned. Teachers' participation in school meetings largely depends on how well the meeting is planned and organised. A well-planned meeting is one whose members are pre-informed of the agenda, time, and venue of the meeting and are given the opportunity to submit other issues for incorporation as agenda items and as well as given the opportunity to participate. In addition, it must be one, which is properly convened (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978). Therefore, one can say that the meetings did not give room for submission of other issues for incorporation as agenda items or they were impromptu meetings and participants did not have the opportunity to submit issues for incorporation as agenda items but only had to participate or the participants lack the competence to do so.

3. The study revealed that a majority of teachers were not members of school committees. This finding is in contrast with Mankoe (2002) and Ozigi's (1991), view that all members of the teaching staff must be engaged in, at least, one or two committees so that all talents could be maximized to the benefits of the school without overburdening a few teachers.

4. The study further found all three senior secondary schools to have school Board of Governors with teacher representation. This finding is as result of the role school Board of Governors play in the management of the schools. Without such a body, the school cannot carry out certain activities. Therefore, they are compelled to institute it. The representation of teachers in a school Board of Governors is restricted by guidelines governing the composition of such a body. In line with the guidelines a single teacher represents all teachers in a school at school Board meetings irrespective of the teachers. One is unrepresentative considering the teacher population of each school and would not give teachers any meaningful participation in such meetings.

The study, furthermore, found teachers' demographic characteristics such as age, years of teaching experience, duration of service in present school, and academic qualification to be statistically and positively related to school decision making areas such as students' matters, staffing, school-community relationship, and financial matters respectively but practically insignificant while gender and teacher professionalism have no correlation with any of school decision making areas. This finding is supported by Kuku and Taylor (2002), whose study in the North Philippines found that there is no evidence that the variables (gender, age years of service in the same school) are significantly associated with the actual level of faculty (departmental) teachers' participation in shared decision making. On matters of gender, Brown (1996), reported a similar finding. Trotter (1996), also, found that teachers with fewer years of service (1-5 years) in the same school show no higher level of participation in decision making than their colleagues who

have been in the school for six years or more. Also, on the contrary, Kuku and Taylor (2002), found that teachers who have been in the profession for 11-20 years were more actively involved in matters regarding curriculum and instruction and staff development than their colleagues with less years of teaching experience. However, Owens as cited in Mankoe (2002), explained that experienced and inexperienced teachers in a secondary school may have different views about participation in specific decision making areas. Rusch and Perry (1999), cautioned that individuals with longer service records can become very structured, inflexible and at times reluctant to share power for fear of taking risk, and changing roles and responsibilities. Moreover, Kuku and Taylor (2002), indicated that respondents with baccalaureate degree (advanced level certificates) show greater involvement in decision related to operation of secondary schools than their colleagues with master's degrees. On the opposite, Hwangbo (1996), found that teachers with higher educational qualifications desire more participation in share decision making than their colleagues with lower qualifications. In addition, the investigation into the factors that influence teachers' participation in school decision making revealed the following findings:

1. The low order need such as the need for belongingness was ranked as the first topmost factor responsible for teacher participation in school decision making. This finding was earlier noted by Hezberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959), as a need whose fulfillment in the pursuit of an organisational goal brings job satisfaction. Hezberg et al (1959), found the need for belongingness (peer and group relationship) as a job-environment factor (dissatisfier), which does not motivate but can

cause job dissatisfaction if it is not present in the accepted standard. However, other researchers such as Mashow as cited in Lucey (1994), argued that both job-content motivators and job-environmental factors including the need for belongingness do separately motivate. This is what Burke and Bittel (1981), meant when they cited employee participation in decision making as a motivator, which employees work to attain in pursuit of the goals of an organisation. On the contrary, Gregory and Ricky (1998), viewed that employees (teachers) who successfully participate in a decision making, its implementation and achieving its desired outcomes satisfy their high order needs such as the needs for achievement, recognition, responsibility and self-esteem, which according to Lucey (1994), are responsible for increased productivity.

2. The need to work to meet job standards was ranked as the second topmost factor accountable for teacher participation in school decision making. This finding agrees with Plunkett and Fournier's, (1996) assertion that teacher involvement in school decision making is a powerful "antidote" against complacency and failure in any institution. In line with this, Lucey (1994), explained that, in such situation, teachers usually implement their decisions with greater speed and effectiveness to attain the expected result. Therefore, substantial decrease in time required in implementing them (Cameron & Whetten, 1995).

3. The need to acquired new knowledge was ranked as the third topmost factor behind teacher participation in school decision making. This result confirms the assertion by Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), that when teachers are participants in the complete process of decision making they are likely to acquire some experience which could put them in a better position to make work decisions for themselves without overburdening their superior's (school head's) for advice or slow down work in the absence of their school heads. On the same line, Wesley (1991), noted that the best way teachers can influence their professional practices is to spend some.

4. The acceptance of one's job as a central part of one's life was ranked as the fourth topmost factor responsible for teacher participation in school decision making. This finding supports the view of Smylie (1996), that teachers who participate in school decision making in turn, become ideologically and culturally committed to act in the best interest of the institution with a true sense of ownership. Cosgrave (1975), noted that such employees (teachers) usually see their work as a central part of their life.

5. The need to use new teaching methods and the need to acquaint oneself with the use of new equipment were ranked as fifth and sixth respectively as factors responsible for teachers' participation in school decision making. This result buttresses the assertion that teacher, who participate in school decision making are more willing to take instructional risks and experiment with new ideas. As a result, there is

continuous improvement in classroom practice and the overall performance of the students (Abdal-Haqq, 1988).

6. The study found that the correlation between teachers' participation in school decision making and teachers' desire to participate in school decision making was practically insignificant (r = 0.149, p<0.10 with one degree freedom). Finally, factors such as the need for belongingness, the need to work to meet job standards, the need to acquire knowledge, the acceptance of one's job as a central part of one's life, the need to use new teaching methods, and the need to acquaint oneself with the use of new equipment have corresponding degree of relevance to teacher motivation via participative decision making. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) noted that these are some of the motivating factors behind successful schools. Burke and Bittel (1981) also pointed out that school heads could create opportunities for teachers to satisfy these needs in pursuit of the goals of their schools. This will motivate teachers to improve their own performance and that of their students.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter five contains the summary of results, conclusions, recommendations and suggestion for future studies.

Summary

Teachers' participation in school decision-making is identified as a key tool in improving academic achievements of students in schools (Smylie, 1996). However, much has not been done to find out whether teachers want to be partners in school decision-making. This descriptive study sought to find out the state of teacher participation in school decision-making in the three senior public secondary schools in the Kadjebi District. A random sample of 84 professional teachers who were serving in their present schools in the district for a period not less than six months provided information on their background characteristics, their level of participation in school decision-making, school decision-making areas of their schools, ways of involving them in school decision-making, their demographic characteristics which are associated with their participation in school decision-making and factors which influence their participation in school decision-making. These data were collected using questionnaires I administered to teachers and heads of the schools. These questionnaires were distributed to and collected from the respondents personally with the help of the assistant headmaster of each school. This was done in four working days during morning and afternoon break periods. The responses of these questionnaires were edited and coded

manually. The number of individuals' scoring the various responses of each item was tallied using SPSS. The results were presented as frequencies, percentages and means for comprehension. The item scoring the highest frequency on a given response/category or the highest mean was considered as the majority opinion of the respondents on the item in question.

However, in some situations, other dimensions were correlated to ascertain their relationships using a computer program called SPSS [11.5]. The dimensions with correlations closer to positive one or negative one and with calculated significant values less than their designated table critical values were accepted as statistically and practically significant. Based on these, each finding was drawn and discussed.

Major Findings

The analysis of field data for the study revealed the following results:

1. On the level of teachers' participation in school decision-making in Senior High School in the Kadjebi District, it was found out that teachers were most often in consultative decision-making with their school heads.

2. On school decision-making areas of teachers' participation, it was found out that teachers always participated in making decision on matters involving curriculum and instruction. Some occasionally participated in making decisions on matters involving school operations and school-community relationship. It was also found out that some teachers never participated in making decisions on students' admission and placement, staffing and financial matters.

3. On the ways of involving teachers in school decision-making, it was found

out that most teachers participated in school-decision making through school meetings, school committees and delegation. However, most of them did not participate in decision-making through school Board of Governors.

4. On what demographic characteristics of teachers are associated with their participation in school decision making, it was found out that the relationship between teachers' demographic characteristics (age, year of teaching experience, duration of service in present school and academic qualification) and their participation in school decision-making areas (such as students' matters, staffing, school-community relationship and financial matters) was found to be practically insignificant.

5. On what factors influence teachers' participation in school decision-making, it was found out that teachers' were influenced into school decision-making by factors such as the need for belongingness, the need to work to meet job standards, the need to acquire knowledge, the acceptance of one's job as a central part of one's life, the need to use new teaching methods and the need to acquaint oneself with the use of new equipments.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. There was a high level of teacher participation in decision-making in areas where teachers were directly responsible for such decisions. For example since teachers planned their lesson notes and decided on the teaching and learning support materials to be used, it was found out that their participation in curriculum and instruction decision-making was high. This possibly placed teachers in a position that compelled them to interpret and

implement the content of the curriculum to meet the needs of students and therefore enhanced their academic achievements.

2. Teachers participated in decision-making through delegation, consultation and representation on committees and school boards. Although, their representation on the board was small but the fact that they participated in school meetings and on various committees meant that activities in their schools did not slow down or come to a halt in the absence of their school heads. This certainly might have led to effective academic work and therefore enhanced students' academic performance.

3. The low teacher participation in decision-making areas like students' admission and placement, staffing and financial issues could be attributed to the administrative practices in place in the schools. For example the Computerized School Selection and Placement System (CSSPS) placed students' in their programmes and schools, the Regional Director with the approval from the Director General of the Ghana Education Service recruits teachers and the administration structure of the schools shows that the school accountant deals directly with the head of school. Teachers who used the materials bought are in a better position to advise what should be bought but that was normally not the case. This could be de-motivating and might have led to low output of teachers and therefore affect academic performance of students.

4. However, it was also noted that factors that influenced teachers to participate in school decision-making had corresponding varying degree of relevance to teacher motivation.

5. The study revealed that teachers as a result of certain factors were

motivated to highly participate in school decision-making in areas where they were directly responsible. On the other hand they never or least participated in decision-making areas where administrative practices placed such participation in decision-making beyond them.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made:

1. The heads of schools should adopt leadership styles that would create the needed environment for teachers to participate in all areas of decision making in the school particularly on students admissions, recruitment of staff and school finance.

2. In those decision-making areas like the use of school facilities and the formulation of guidelines for their use and school-community relationship, where teachers occasionally participate in school decision-making, school heads should make conscious efforts to at all times to involve teachers .

3. The heads of schools should create the needed environment for teachers to participate in decision-making in pursue of goals of their schools. This would give the teachers the opportunity to satisfy their needs in order to bring about improvement in their own performance and that of their students.

Suggestions for Further Studies

From this study, it was found that teachers do not participate in decision-

making concerning students' admission and placement, staffing and financial matters. This study, therefore, suggests a follow-up study to find out why teachers do not participate in those aspects of decision-making.

REFERENCES

Abdal-Haqq, T. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weight the evidence.*
    Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Aboagye, I. K. (2002). *Historical and philosophical foundations of education in
    Ghana.* Accra: Media Guard Ltd.

Abosi O. C., & Brookman-Amissah, J. (Eds), (1992).Development of education in
    Ghana 1880-1990. *Introduction to education in Ghana,* (pp.11-25).
    Accra: Sedco Publishing Limited.

Ackummey, M. A. (2003). *Organization and administration of a school guidance
    programme.* Accra: Media Graphics and Press Limited.

Adesina, S. (1990). *Educational management.* Enugu (Nigeria): Fourth
    Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.

Annoh, K. (1995). *Education.* Kumasi: Berks Press.

Antwi, M. K. (1992). *Education, society, and development.* Accra:
    Unimax Publishers Limited.

Asiedu-Akrofi, K. (1978). *School organization in modern Africa.* Tema:
    Ghana Publishing Corporation.

Atakpa, S. K., & Ankomah, Y. A. (1998). Report on baseline study on the state of
    school management in Ghana: *Journal of Educational Management, 1*(1),
    1-20.

Babbie, E. (1983). *The practice of social research.* (3rd ed). Belmont: Wadsworth
    Publishing Company.

Bame, K. N. *(1991).Teacher motivation and retention in Ghana,* Accra:

Ghana University Press.

Brown, D. W. (1996). Principals' perceptions of community and staff involvement

in shared decision making: *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 12*

(1), 17-24.

Burke, R. S., & Bittel, L. R. (1981).*1ntroduction to management practice.* Ohio:

McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Cameron, K., & Whetten, D. A. (1995). *Developing management skills.* (3rd ed).

New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Commonwealth Secretariat, *(l993).Better schools resource materials for school*

heads: Managing the curriculum and resources. Module 3. London:

Marlborough House.

Commonwealth Secretariat, (1993). *Better schools resource materials for school*

heads: Managing the curriculum and resources. Module 4. London:

Marlborough House.

Commonwealth Secretariat, (1993). *Better schools resource materials for school*

heads: Managing the curriculum and resources. Module 5. London:

Marlborough House.

Commonwealth Secretariat, (1993). *Better schools resource materials for school*

heads: Managing the curriculum and resources. Module 7. London:

Marlborough House.

Cosgrave, G. (1975). *Career planning: search for a future.* Toronto: University of

Toronto.

Doudu, F. W. K. (2001). *The school administrator.* Winneba: Artedu Publication.

Dublin, A. J. (1997). *Essential management.* Ohio: South-Western Publishing.

Farrant, I. S (1980). *Principles and practice of education.* (2nd ed.). Singapore:

> Singapore Publishers Ltd.

Fraenkel, J. R, & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research*

> *in education,* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Ghana Education Service Council, *(2000).Ghana national association of*

> *teachers (GNAT) conditions and scheme of service and the code*

> *of conduct for teacher.* Accra: Benediction Printing Press.

Ghana Education Service, (2002). *Circuit supervisors' handbook.* Accra: MoE.

Ghana Education Service, (2003). *Constitution of Board of Governors.* Accra:

> MoE.

Ghana Education Service, (1994). *Head teachers 'handbook.* Accra:

> Ministry of Education.

Government of Ghana (2002). *Meeting the challenges of education in the twenty*

> *first century: Report on president's committee on review of education*

> *reforms in Ghana.* Accra: Adwinsa Publication (GH) Ltd.

Government of Ghana, (2003). *Financial administration Act, 2003, Act 654.*

> Accra: GOG.

Gregory, M. & Ricky, G. W. *(1998).Managing people and organization:*

> *Organizational behaviour.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Synderman, B. *(1959).The motivation to work.* (2nd ed). New York: John Wiley.

Hwangbo, Y. (1996). Relationships between organizational and psychological factors and teachers' participation in decision-making processes in early childhood settings. *Abstracts item* s: 9711694.

Jones, R. (1990). *Quantitative analysis,* London: Pittman Publishing.

Kellaway, G. P. (1967). *Education for living.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Keller, F. J. (1998). *Principles of vocational education.* Boston: D.C Heath and Company

Kochlar, S. K. (2001). *Secondary school administration.* New Delhi: Sterling Publishing Private Limited.

Kuku, S. M., & Taylor, J. W. (2002).Teacher participating in decision-making: A comparative study of school leader and teacher perceptions in North Philippine. *Academics 5* (1). 19-46.

Laid, A. D., & Laid, C. E. (1987). *The technique of delegating: How to get things done through others.* London: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.

Lucey, T. (1994). *Business administration.* London: Publications Ltd.

MacWilliam, H. O. A. (l959).*The development of education in Ghana.* London: Longmans.

Mankoe, O. (2002). *Educational administration and management in Ghana.* Accra: Progressive Star Printing Press.

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, (2005). *A Brief on computerized schools selection and placement system,* Accra: MoE.

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (1994). *Interim report on the 1994 results of the criterion reference tests for primary six pupils.* Accra: MoE

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (2005). Accra: MoE.

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, *(2003).The report on the 2002 results of the criterion referenced tests for primary six pupil,* Accra: MoE

Mullins, J. L. (1996). *Management and organizational behaviour* (4th ed.) London: Pitman Publishing.

Oakshott, L. (1994). *Essential elements of business statistics.* London: Guernsey Press Co. Ltd.

Ozigi, O. A. (1995). *A hand book on school administration and management.* Hong Kong: McMillan Education Ltd.

Pecku, N. K. (1991). *Introduction to guidance for training colleges.* (2nd ed.), Accra: Ghana University press.

Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1990). *Global teacher global learner.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Plunkett, L. C., & Fournier, R. (1996). *Participative management implementing empowerment.* New York: John Willey & Sons, Inc.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1985). School reform: The district policy implication of the effective schools literature. *The Elementary School Journal. 85* (3). 4-10.

Roger, D.W. & Joseph, R. D. (1983). *Mass media research: An*

introduction (2nd ed). Belmont: Wadswoth Publishing Company.

Reid, K., Hopkins, D., & Holly P. (1990). *Towards the effective school: The problems and some solutions.* England: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Rusch, E., & Perry, E. (1999). Resistance to change: An alternative story. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 8*(3), 285-300.

Russell, J. J., Cooper, B. S., & Greenblatt, R. B. (1992). *Teacher involvement and participation scale* (Version 2).New.York: RBG Associates.

Sabo, D. L; Barnes, K. & Hoy, W. K. (1996). Organizational health and decision participation: An empirical analysis of health interpersonal dynamics and teacher participation. *Journal of School Leadership,* 6 (6), 576-599.

Sekyere, E. A. (1998). *Teachers' guide to promotion interview.* Kumasi: The Book Industry Publication Unit.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J (1998). *Supervision: A redefinition.* Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies

Smylie, M.(1996). Teacher participation in school decision-making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy. 14*(1), 53-67

Super, D., & Knase, E. (1981). Career development in adulthood: Some theoretical problems and possible solution. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling. 9.* 192-201

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, H.W. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review. 36*(2). March- April., 34-39.

Taylor, D. L., & Tashakkoror, A. (1997). Toward an understanding of teachers'

desire for participation in decision-making. *Journal of Educational*

Leadership. 7(6), 609-629.

Trotter, J. L. (1996). Comparison of perceptions of principals and teachers

concerning shared decision making at the elementary level. Abstract from:

ProQuest file: *Dissertation Abstracts item: 9626616.*

Wesley, P. A. (1991).*Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities*

of practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

West Africa Examination Council (2005). *Annual report.* Accra: WAEC.

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

(IEPA)

CAPE COAST, GHANA

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR HIGH/TECHNICAL SCHOOL TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

Stakeholders in education have advocated teachers' participation in school governance as a way of improving the academic achievement of schools. However, not much has being done to find out whether teachers' actually desire to be partners in school decision-making. It is against this background that this research is conducted to find out the state of teachers' participation in senior secondary school decision-making in the Kadjebi District. It is the researcher's hope that your honest responses to the items of the enclosed questionnaire will contribute in improving the academic performance of students in the district. Please, your responses will be kept completely confidential. The University of Cape Coast has approved this study.

SECTION A

Level of Teacher Participation in School decision-making

INSTRUCTIONS: Rank the following statements according to the practice of decision-making in your school. Please write the ordinal number 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th in the bracket at the beginning of each statement in the order of ranking.

[1st = very often, 2nd = often, 3rd = least often and 4th = never,

[   ] The school head makes a decision alone and announces it to the teachers.

1)   [   ] The school head makes decision and sells it to the teachers to solicit their supports.

2)   [   ] The school head presents the problem to the teachers and solicits their suggestions before he/she makes the final decision.

3)   [   ] The school head presents the problem to the teachers and jointly takes the decision with them.

4)   [   ] The school head presents the problem to the teachers, defines the limit of authority and leaves them alone to take the needed decisions within the defined limit of authority.

SECTION B

Areas of teacher participation in school decision-making

INSTRUCTIONS: Tick [√] the response that best describes the degree of your involvement in the activity of each statement.

6) I decide the teaching and learning support materials for my lessons.

114

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

7) I plan my lesson a lone.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

8) I participate in formulating guidelines for students' admission into my school.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

9) I participate in the placement of students into programs of study in my school.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

10) I participate in formulation of guidelines for the recruitment of teachers into my school.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

11) I recommend my fellow teachers for promotion.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

12) I participate in the formulation of safety guidelines for the use of my school facilities.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

13) I take part in deciding the use of my school facilities.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

14) I participate in the formulation of guidelines involving my school participation in community programmes.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

15) I take part in activities of the parent teacher association [pta] in my school.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

16) I actively participate in planning my school clean-up exercises in the community.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

17) I take part in deciding how much my department spends each year.

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

18) Do you know the amount of money voted for your department each academic year?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

SECTION C

TEACHER PARTICIPATION THROUGH DELEGATION, MEETINGS

AND COMMITTEES

INSTRUCTIONS: Tick [√] in the bracket your response for each item.

19) Activities in my school slow down when my school head is away.

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

20) My school head takes a long time to get a simple job done.

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

21) My school head does follow-up to find out how far i have performed an assigned job.

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

22) I put forward issues for discussion during staff meetings in my school.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

23) I submit issues as agenda items for discussion at staff meetings.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

24) I take part in discussions at staff meetings.

Always [   ]   frequently [   ]   occasionally [   ]   never [   ]

25) Does your school have a board of governors?   Yes [   ]   No [   ]

26) If yes, what number of teachers in your school is/are board member(s)?

[   ] none   [   ] one   [   ] two   [   ] three   [   ] more than three

27) Which of the following committee(s) exist(s) in your school?

[   ] Disciplinary Committee [   ] Food Committee [   ]

Entertainment Committee [   ] Maintenance Committee   [   ] Academic

Board [   ] Procurement Committee   [   ]

Others (specify)..

28) Which of the following committees are you a member?

[   ] Discipline Committee [   ] Food Committee   [   ] Entertainment

Committee [   ]

Maintenance Committee   [   ] Academic Board [   ]

Procurement Committee   [   ]   [   ]

Others (specify)..

SECTION D

FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHERS PARTICIPATION IN

DECISION-MAKING

INSTRUCTIONS: write in the brackets at the beginning of each statement whether you strongly agree [SA], agree [a], uncertain [UC], disagree [d] or strongly disagree [SD] with it.

29) I feel as being part of the school when i participate in school decision-making.

30) [   ] I feel as being recognized when i take part in school decision-making.

31) [   ] I acquire new knowledge from my participation in school decision-making.

32) [   ] my skills in decision-making are enhanced due to involvement in school decision-making.

33) [   ] I can now take some decisions without relying much on my superiors.

34) [   ] I can now take on a little high responsibility with confidence.

35) [   ] I prefer working a little more on my job to attain results.

36) [   ] I always work to meet job standards.

37) [   ] I use new teaching methods.

38) [   ] I easily acquaint myself with new teaching methods.

39) [   ] I easily acquaint myself with the use of new equipment.

40) [   ] I see the school as my own.

41) [   ] I see my job as central part of my life.

INSTRUCTION: Tick [√] in the brackets your response for each item

42) Are you involved in school decision-making?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

43) Do you desire to be involved?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

44) [   ] I take part in school decision-making when my interest is at stake.

45) [   ] I participate in school decision-making when i have the expertise to contribute meaningfully.

46) [   ] I take part in school decision-making when i have the authority to do so.

SECTION E

Demographic characteristics of teachers associated with teacher

participation in school decision-making

INSTRUCTION: Tick [√] in the brackets your response for each item.

47) Sex

[   ] Male   [   ] Female

48) Age   [   ] 29 years or less   [   ] 30 – 39 years

[   ] 40 – 49 years   [   ] 49 years or more

49) Numbers of years in teaching [   ] 5 years or less

[   ] 6 – 12 years   [   ] 13 – 19 years   [   ] 20 years or more

50) Number of years taught in your present school [   ] 5 months or less

[   ] 6 – 12 months   [   ] 13 – 19 months   [   ] 20 months or more

51) Highest academic qualification [   ]   Below first degree

[   ] First degree   [   ] Second degree   [   ] PhD

52) Are you a professional teacher?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION